

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY



3 1761 02792110 5





THE LIBRARY
of
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY
Toronto

BX 8800 Res.

C 22

Presented to

Moss College Library
Toronto

1st Jan 1886

A. J. Carson

PLYMOUTH HERESIES.

Ballantyne Press
BALLANTYNE, HANSON AND CO.
EDINBURGH AND LONDON

.

THE HERESIES
OF
THE PLYMOUTH BRETHREN.

BY
JAMES C. L. CARSON, M.D.

Fifteenth Thousand.

LONDON:
HOULSTON & SONS.
1883.

BX
8800
C37
1883

EMMANUEL

45094953

24222.

12-4-13.

PREFACE.



MANY parties imagine, because the Plymouths have no professed Confession of Faith, that they have no regular system of belief, but this is a great mistake. They not only have a very complete system, but they are as tyrannical as Rome in keeping their followers to it. Although the Christian public cannot divine what their system is, it is all perfectly understood by those who are thoroughly initiated into it. The great difficulty of getting at it, arises from the fact that it is always put forth in a completely Jesuitical form. It is entirely to this it owes its success. It is so thoroughly "guarded," that Mr. Darby seems to be surprised I was able to unfold it, as he says, "the incriminated language, not one in a thousand would have noticed as anything particular." In place of trying to make everything plain and specific to the eye of the Christian public, the Darbyites have managed to cloak their opinions by using language in a Jesuitical sense, and the consequence is, that few of the parties who have hitherto tilted with them, seem to have been able to discover the peculiarities of the sect, or yet thoroughly to expose and overturn their obnoxious

sentiments. They have been frequently met in such a powerless way, by men who were not naturally fitted for the task, or who were not thoroughly up to their system, that the opposition they have encountered has only added strength to their cause. Unless a person makes himself properly acquainted with the opinions he controverts, keeps closely and strictly to Bible principles, argues carefully, accurately, and with the utmost precision on every point, and hits home without fear or dread, it is impossible to manage such wily and slippery customers.

It has been supposed that Plymouthism should be spared on account of some good people who have entered its fold. It is unfortunately true that simple-minded Christians have, in many instances, given in their adhesion to the sect. They have been deceived by the plausible sanctimoniousness of the Plymouth leaders. In place of making this a reason, however, for sparing the hypocrisy of the system, it is only a greater argument for its radical exposure, as a proper warning to the unsuspicious and unwary. Moreover, Plymouthism is not now what it was in the beginning. At its commencement, its aim appeared to be good, and many excellent men were attracted towards it; but it has now run into the wildest extremes imaginable; has become as entirely Jesuitical as the system of Loyola itself; and by the denial of the moral law as the rule of life, has led, in many instances, to the most disastrous consequences.

COLERAINE, IRELAND, 1883.

CONTENTS.



	PAGE
THE HUMANITY OF CHRIST	I
SOCINIANISM	30
THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST	40
MACKINTOSH VALOUR	76
THE PASTORAL OFFICE	79
THE PRESIDENCY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT	137
THE LAW A RULE OF LIFE	159
VARIATIONS OF PLYMOUTHISM	172
MORALITY OF PLYMOUTHISM	229
MR. MACKINTOSH'S RECANTATION.	257
MR. DARBY'S REPLIES	265

PLYMOUTH HERESIES.



THE HUMANITY OF CHRIST.

THE Editor of the *Coleraine Chronicle*, in his paper for the 22d of February 1862, found fault with the *Quarterly Journal of Prophecy* for charging Mr. Mackintosh with denying that "Christ's body was of the substance of the Virgin;" and he expressed his belief that the charge could not be sustained, and therefore should not have been put forth by a respectable journal. As I understood that Mr. Mackintosh and his followers held heretical views regarding the person of Christ, I was surprised at the editor's statement, and therefore I took the trouble of examining Mr. Mackintosh's "Notes on Leviticus," where I found, page 35, the following expression:—"The first Adam, even in his unfallen condition, was 'of the earth;' but the second Man was, as to His manhood, 'the Lord from heaven.'" This surely puts Mr. Mackintosh's opinion beyond the slightest doubt. He emphatically asserts that Christ, "*as to His manhood,*"

was the Lord from heaven. There can be no mistake here. If, *as to His manhood*, He was the Lord from heaven, He could not by any possibility whatever be of the substance of the Virgin. To speak of His being the Lord as to His manhood seems a strange contradiction in terms. He was perfect man and perfect God ; but He could not be God in His humanity, nor man in His Godhead : such a thing is simply impossible. As Mr. Mackintosh, however, expressly and intentionally applies the term Lord to the humanity of Christ, he should openly join the Socinians and Unitarians in denying that the expression Lord is a proof of the divinity of Christ. This would make him appear consistent with himself, no matter how derogatory it might be to his profession of Christianity. "The zeal," says the *Journal of Prophecy*, "with which the party are now propagating the Socinian view of the sacrifices is remarkable, and it shows the direction in which Plymouthism is moving." I am not aware of any passage of Scripture which contains Mr. Mackintosh's words, and says that Christ, *as to His manhood*, is the Lord from heaven. The expression, *as to His manhood*, has been added cautiously and intentionally. The Scripture says, "The first man is of the earth, earthy ; the second Man is the Lord from heaven ;" but it nowhere asserts that the *soul* of Adam was earthy, and the *body* of Christ the Lord from heaven ; and this makes all the differ-

ence in the world. Regarding the divinity of Christ, there are plenty of proofs that He is the Lord from heaven ; but regarding His manhood, we are expressly told He "was made of the seed of David according to the flesh. . . . God sent forth His Son, made of a woman. . . . I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star."

In this enlightened age, and in this free country, every man has a right to promulgate his own views, provided he puts them fairly, plainly, and openly before the community, and can persuade the people to listen or read. But no man is justified in catching the unwary by small distillations of truth, whilst the opportunity is taken of gradually and almost imperceptibly slipping in the deadly poison. "The doctrine of reserve," says Mr. Spurgeon, "so detestable in the mouths of Jesuits, is not one whit the less villainous when accepted by Protestants." The Plymouth Brethren come amongst us, as they say, to preach the "gospel of the grace of God." In their public addresses they produce very little beyond what the people already believe. In this way they gain a hearing and a position which they could not possibly attain to, if they would plainly and openly declare *all* their sentiments in the ears of the people. The public get the choice things, whilst the peculiarities are kept for the benefit of those who are gradually drawn into the mysteries of this most decided sect of

all the sects. I ask, Is this fair? Is it honest? Are they ashamed of their peculiarities? or are they well convinced that, if these peculiarities were fully known, the hair of their hearers' heads would almost be made to stand upon end, and the preachers would soon be left alone in their glory? It is very easy to find out the real sentiments of a straightforward man; but the double-dealing of the Plymouths makes it difficult to get at their opinions. A Plymouth writer, signing himself W. K., in his review of Mr. Rees, says, "Doubtless the difficulty [of ascertaining their opinions] is great for an outsider. Not one Christian in a thousand can understand till he is *bona fide* in fellowship, though he may know enough to attract him, and more than enough to condemn denominationalism in every form." Just think of the system when one of the leaders is obliged to make such a confession! The outside Christian must get enough to attract him; but he must be really in fellowship before the genuine opinions of the Plymouths can be placed before him in a form capable of being understood. If the sentiments were put in language which was meant to be interpreted on honest principles, any man of ordinary understanding could comprehend them; but in order that the uninitiated may not be frightened from the system by the terrible opinions which they are afterwards obliged to imbibe, a thorough plan of double-dealing must be adopted. If such a course would

disgrace men of the world, it is surely nothing short of disgusting when used by men calling themselves Christians.

The success of Plymouthism is owing entirely to the jesuitical conduct of its adherents. Its peculiarities are either shrouded in a sort of mystery, or it is pretended that the sentiments held are different from what they really are. Mrs. Grattan Guinness has lent a helping hand in this direction. After professing to be intimately acquainted with the Plymouths, and to "approve of most of their distinctive views," she says "that on the fundamental truths of the gospel they are at one with all evangelical denominations ;" whereas, the real state of the fact is, that there are very few of the great fundamental doctrines on which they are at one with evangelical Christians. The truth of this assertion of mine shall be made abundantly evident before this work is finished. Mrs. Guinness has a right, if she pleases, to be a Plymouth, and to "approve of most of the distinctive views" of that sect ; but she has no right to gloss matters over for the purpose of making it appear that the Plymouth views agree with those held by evangelical Christians on the great fundamental doctrines of the gospel. "Strange and exaggerated statements," says she, "have been made with regard to them, and an erroneous impression seems to prevail that their views are sadly heterodox, and their practices some-

what fanatical." In place of thus merely asserting that it was an error to charge their views with heterodoxy, and their practices with fanaticism, it would have been well if Mrs. Guinness had quoted and criticised the statements which she stigmatises as exaggerated. Her readers would then have been able to judge how far her assertions were to be depended on. By all means let her be what she is, a Plymouth; but let her not try to make us believe that the Plymouths hold the orthodox views on the great fundamentals of Christianity. There is something peculiarly distressing and lamentable in the fact of a person making a high profession of religion, and at the same time advocating one of the most thoroughly jesuitical systems the world has ever produced; — a system which, in an insidious form, undermines nearly every one of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity as held by our evangelical churches. I am extremely sorry that I must also pass an adverse opinion on the course adopted by Mr. H. Grattan Guinness. In his Letter to the Plymouths on the Pastoral Office, he says, "From the first of my acquaintance with you as a body of Christians, my heart was drawn towards you. . . . I should have heartily cast in my lot with you, and taken my place among you, but for one thing — I never could persuade myself that your views and practices as regards the questions of pastorship and ministry were scriptural." Now, to say

the least of it, I think it is much to be regretted that Mr. Guinness, in place of occupying for some years, under the appearance of orthodox sentiments, the Dissenting pulpits of England, Ireland, and Scotland, did not announce, in a fair and straightforward manner, at the very first, that he was at one with the Plymouths on every point, with the single exception of pastorship and ministry. Although such an announcement would have closed the pulpits against him, it would have placed his conduct in a very different position from that in which it must now be viewed. No man can really help on genuine Christianity by passing with the public for one thing when in reality he is another. There can be no excuse for his hiding the fact of his Plymouthism until the 8th of October 1863.

In the first edition of his "Notes on Leviticus," Mr. Mackintosh says, pages 29 and 30, "There is one consideration which should weigh heavily in the estimation of every Christian, and that is, the vital nature of the doctrine of Christ's humanity. It lies at the very foundation of Christianity. . . . While I feel called upon to warn the reader against strange sounds, in reference to the divine mystery of Christ's humanity, I do not deem it needful to discuss such sounds." Does the quotation I have made not plainly show that Mr. Mackintosh is about to propound some doctrine, regarding the humanity of

Christ, which has not been generally received by the Christian Church? Observe, it is not a doctrine regarding the *Godhead* of Christ; but a doctrine regarding His *humanity*. It is not the mystery of the *union* of His Godhead with His humanity, but the "mystery of Christ's humanity" alone. We are not warned against "strange sounds" in reference to His divinity, but only in regard to His humanity. Is there a man in Christendom could read his observations without being convinced that Mr. Mackintosh holds some ideas regarding the humanity of Christ different from those entertained by the great body of professing Christians? I rather think not. But the question is put beyond the possibility of dispute in other parts of the very same chapter from which I have already quoted. At page 31 he calls Christ a "divine man." Now, if He be a *divine man*, He cannot possibly possess *our* humanity, because a divine man must of necessity be God in what is thus called, however improperly, His humanity. Christ is both God and man; but He is neither a divine man nor a man-God. Again, page 35, he says, "The first Adam, even in his unfallen condition, was 'of the earth,' but the second Man was, as to His manhood, 'the Lord from heaven.'" No words in the English language could make his meaning plainer than this. His statement is specific, unmistakable, and to the point. If, as to His *manhood*, He was "the Lord from

heaven," He did not partake of the substance of the Virgin ; He did not possess a particle of *our* humanity ; He was God in His very body, and had no *real* humanity. Further, page 56, it is stated that "the intelligent interpretation of it (the meat-offering) must ever guard, with holy jealousy, the precious truth of Christ's heavenly humanity." If His *humanity* be heavenly, it cannot be in any sense the substance of the Virgin ; if it was sent from heaven, it was not formed upon earth. Such is Mr. Mackintosh's Christ ; but he is not the Christ of Scripture, which says, "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same. . . . God sent forth His Son, made of a woman. . . . Which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh." The Christ described by Mr. Mackintosh is not the Christ of revelation, and consequently cannot be the saviour of sinners.

The quotations I have given are amply sufficient to demonstrate the heterodoxy of Mr. Mackintosh's views. His words are so plain that it is quite impossible to misunderstand them. I would not dare to insult any of my readers, as Mr. Mackintosh has *lately* done his, by supposing that the language could, under any circumstances, be misunderstood by them. Misunderstanding here is quite impossible by any person who is one degree removed from simplicity. To suppose the words used could mean any other thing than that

which I have taken out of them, would be to suppose that Mr. Mackintosh had no idea of the meaning of language, and was utterly incapable of writing intelligibly on any subject. If he does not understand the fair import of the language he uses, he should at once cease from attempting to instruct the people either in writing or speaking. For my part, however, I am convinced, when he penned those words, he understood them in the very same sense as I understand them.

Having fully established the nature of the views which were maintained by Mr. Mackintosh at the time he wrote his "Notes on Leviticus," I shall now turn to his letter in the *Coleraine Chronicle* in reply to me. I am certain many parties imagine he has recanted the objectionable doctrine; or perhaps some think he has denied ever holding it. We shall see. Mr. Mackintosh says it is strange I should have singled out one passage [the second Man was, *as to His manhood*, the Lord from heaven] from 351 pages to prove the heresy against him. He does not dare to deny, because he could not, that the heresy is contained in that passage, from his 35th page, as plainly as words can make it; but still he argues that a statement on *another* page proves my charge regarding *this one* to be groundless. This is logic with a vengeance! The principle seems to be almost universally acted on, that any imaginable sort of

argument will do in religious affairs, no matter whether it has sense to rest on or not. Let us just apply Mr. Mackintosh's principle to some of the affairs of this life, on which, if not on religion, common-sense is usually allowed to have free action. The law officers of the Crown, we may suppose, bring a man up to be tried for murder. The culprit acknowledges in open court that he did knowingly and wilfully murder a man on Friday last; but, inasmuch as he murdered no other person for the previous 351 Fridays, but rather made a sort of an attempt on one occasion to save a life, he submits that he not only has no right to be found guilty of the murder he committed on the Friday, but he has a right to be very indignant at being put on his trial at all. To use Mr. Mackintosh's language about me, "any candid person would see that." What, I ask, would be thought of the advocate who would defend a case on such principles? Would he not be hissed out of court? And yet this is exactly Mr. Mackintosh's position. He cannot possibly deny that the quotation I have made, from his 35th page, contains the identical meaning, and no other meaning, than the one which I have taken out of it; but inasmuch as the sentence occurs only once in 351 pages, and inasmuch as there is one other passage, on the 37th page, which seems to contradict it, he maintains he is entirely innocent, and I am to blame for want of candour in putting him on his

trial at all ! Alas ! how Christianity suffers by the shuffling of those who call themselves its advocates !

But after all, what is there in this passage referred to by Mr. Mackintosh, on the 37th page ? Nothing at all to the purpose. I never charged Mr. Mackintosh with denying that Christ was *born* of the Virgin, was composed of flesh and blood, and had a human body ; but I did charge him, that he calls this flesh and blood, this human body, “the Lord from heaven,” the “divine man,” and the “heavenly humanity ;” and, consequently, that he makes this flesh and blood, this human body, to be really and truly God. Hence, if this human body was truly God, although it was *born* of the Virgin, it was not *made* of her substance. This is my charge ; and a reference to the preceding pages will show that I have thoroughly proved it. In one place, Mr. Mackintosh says, Christ was “of the seed of the woman,” but in other places he tells us He was “a divine man,” “a heavenly man,” and “*in his manhood* was the Lord from heaven.” Now, these statements directly contradict each other, and therefore cannot possibly both be true. Which of them are we to believe ? Which is true, and which is false ? This is a case of Mackintosh *versus* Mackintosh.

“As to the sentence,” continues Mr. Mackintosh, “to which the Doctor calls your attention [the second Man was, as to His manhood, the Lord from heaven], it means nothing more or less than what the apostle

states in 1 Cor. xv. 47." In place of recanting, Mr. M. here reiterates the original sentiment. His words mean exactly what the apostle says, and the apostle said what Mr. M. means ; or, in other words, according to him, the apostle meant that Christ was, as to His manhood, the Lord from heaven. Certainly, Mr Mackintosh recants after a novel fashion !

"I grant you that had I anticipated controversy," says Mr. Mackintosh, "I would have guarded the sentence of which the Doctor makes such a mountain." Just think of this ! What an expression for a man calling himself a Christian ! Would the greatest heathen that ever lived make such a statement ? He does not say he would have expunged every shred of the deadly doctrine from his book, but, in the face of controversy, he would have *guarded* it ! Like some other expressions in his writings, it would then have been so thoroughly after the fashion of the oracles of ancient days, that a person might read it in any way he pleased. For example, when Mr. Mackintosh speaks, in a multitude of instances, of "the Glorious Person of Christ," and of "the birth of this Glorious Person," what does he mean ? How are we to interpret him ? One man may say he means the glory of the union of the Godhead with the humanity of Christ ; but another has ample room and verge enough to argue that the words apply alone to the glory of His manhood, to what is called, in the Valentinian style of

the second century, the "heavenly humanity;" in short, that it might correspond with the ideas which were stoutly maintained by a poor member of Mr. Mackintosh's congregation in Coleraine, that the Virgin had no more to do with Christ than the pump has with the water which runs through it. This is an uncommonly apt illustration of the views promulgated in the "Notes on Leviticus," and I would like to know where this poor illiterate man got the doctrine, if he did not learn it from Mr. Mackintosh. If Mr. M. never taught it, where did this man find it? Can it be supposed he got it in the writings of the Valentinians, or the Monophysites of the second and fifth centuries? I am certain he never saw, or heard of, their works.

Mr. Mackintosh forbears to animadvert on my speaking of *his* followers. To a certain extent, I must confess my fault here. No doubt, he has many followers; but there are a few *crusty* exceptions. I have it on indisputable authority that some of his disciples have advanced so far towards perfection, that they can not only differ with Mr. Mackintosh, but they can actually find fault with some things done by the apostle Paul. I believe some of the scholars have already become the masters, the rulers, the dictators, and the announcers of the judgments of the Almighty upon those who dispute their opinions. They can very nearly wield the thunderbolts of heaven.

There is just one sentence in Mr. Mackintosh's letter to the *Chronicle*, which surprises me beyond measure. "I believe," says he, "our blessed Lord was really of the substance of the Virgin—as really a man as you or I, sin excepted." This is exactly my own creed on the subject. But I am at a loss to know how Mr. Mackintosh can make such a statement, seeing it is in direct contradiction to what he has said in other places. If this be really his opinion, it is unaccountable how he could have written so much as he has done on the *humanity* of Christ, without ever expressing himself in similar language. I have examined one thousand pages of his writings, and I have failed in finding the exact same expression of belief in any of them ; but I have found plenty on the opposite side. I have already shown that he asserts Christ was "a divine man," that He had a "heavenly humanity," and that "in His manhood" He was "the Lord from heaven." These statements are in direct opposition to the *one* sentence in the *Chronicle*. Now, which of the Mackintoshes are we to believe ? They cannot both be true. Which are we to follow ? On different occasions, Mr. Mackintosh has given opposite and directly contradictory testimony. Which of his statements will he stick to ? His present position forcibly reminds me of the witness who, on his second examination, contradicted the statements of the first. When the counsel reminded him that his evidence of to-day contradicted his affidavit of

yesterday, he said, "Did I swear that yesterday?" On being assured he had done so, he replied, with an oath, if he had he would stand to it. Mr. Mackintosh cannot hold to both sides. Which will he stand to?

Does Mr. Mackintosh use the expressions I am just now considering, in the *Chronicle*, in the ordinary acceptation of the words, or has he, after Plymouth fashion, a private meaning of his own attached to the language? I shall try this point in two ways. First of all, I ask him to tell us plainly, yes or no, does he now believe Christ appeared in *our* humanity? Does he now *deny* that Christ, "as to His manhood, was the Lord from heaven?" Does he now *deny* that Christ was "a divine man?" Does he now *deny* that Christ had a "heavenly humanity?" I must absolutely insist on an explicit answer to all these questions. They are fair, plain, and to the point. I am prepared to answer them all to Mr. Mackintosh; and if he really means his statement in the *Chronicle* to be understood according to the fair construction of the English language, he cannot have the least difficulty in answering them to me. One week will tell the result. He has so thoroughly "*guarded*" his remarks in the paper, that he has nowhere said his belief is now different from what it was when he first published that Christ, "as to His manhood, was the Lord from heaven." This is a most significant fact; and I am determined to sift it to the bottom. I will have no evasion of the

point. I must wait the next issue of the paper for the reply ; but, in the meantime, I shall try his opinion by a second method.

Mr. Mackintosh has not denied, and he cannot, and dare not, deny, that in the first edition of his "Notes on Leviticus" he has published statements which, if his *one* sentence in the *Chronicle* be correct, are thoroughly and unmistakably heterodox, on a fundamental and completely vital point of Christianity. Like every other man, he has a perfect right to change his opinions ; and if he has changed them, and publicly announced the change, he has a right to be respected by every honourable man. Has he announced the change ? Has he given us sufficient evidence of the change ? I rather think not. He has told us in the *Chronicle* that if he had "anticipated controversy," he would have "guarded" the expressions ; but he has nowhere said that the opinions he formerly announced are false. He has carefully avoided this. He has "guarded" it. Until he makes a recantation in plain and unmistakable language, I must persist in believing that he holds to the original doctrine, which runs, in a "guarded" vein, through much of his writings, and which appears openly and boldly in some of them.

If Mr. Mackintosh had really changed his opinions, and had found that he had published statements in the first edition of his "Notes on Leviticus" which contained a deadly and soul-destroying heresy, what

course of conduct, would you, my readers, have expected him to pursue? Would you not have been certain that he would have burned every copy of the book he could lay his hands on, which either directly or indirectly contained the heresy; and that he would also have written to every paper, journal, and magazine in the empire, to which he could find access, in order to warn all parties against the heresy he had unfortunately published? This would have been a plain and effectual way of counteracting the baneful influence of his teaching. Has he done this? Did he ever say one word to that effect till I called him out in the public press? Never, so far as I am aware. Hence I feel certain he has in no way changed his opinions. In the second edition of the "Notes on Leviticus" he has *omitted* a few words, and only a few words, but has sounded no alarm whatever, and taken no means to counteract the deadly poison he has administered. What would be thought of me, if I were to order poison to be mixed up with medicine for a patient, and, after having given a good and effectual dose, I were to stand by till the patient expired, without making the slightest effort to overcome the effects of the poison I had administered? Would it be any excuse for my conduct to say, I will let this case go as it is, but the next time I order medicine I will "guard" it so that few people will be aware it contains the poison? If I "guarded" it so that the

poison would be less capable of being discovered by the patient till its deadly effects would be insured, would my villany not be immensely increased? To be sure it would. Hence, if Mr. Mackintosh, in place of expunging, has only "guarded" the poison, his sin is tenfold greater.

Let us now see how Mr. Mackintosh stands in relation to the *second* edition of his "Notes on Leviticus," which I have just received from London. In the preface, he blesses God that the sale of a large issue of the first edition has proved the great interest taken in the subject. He blesses God that a large edition has been circulated, although it contains the most pernicious doctrine regarding the *humanity* of Christ! And, wonderful to relate, he never in the slightest degree alludes to any heresy in the previous edition; he never points it out; he never mentions what it is; he never warns those who had read it of its dreadful consequences; but contents himself with the following words, which I presume are intended to apply to this point:—"An expression, here and there, which seemed likely to be misunderstood, I have slightly touched. I have also added a brief note or two. These trifling matters excepted, the second edition is a reprint of the first." This is the only warning he has given. Is it any warning at all? Observe, he calls this a trifling matter! A fundamental error regarding the humanity of Christ, a trifling matter!! Could any sane man

believe he has really changed his opinions? I do not. He has slightly touched a few expressions which seemed likely to be "*misunderstood*." Now, I seriously ask Mr. Mackintosh, will he risk his reputation as a writer, a speaker, and an expounder of Scripture, on this statement? Is it true? Will he affirm that any man, who is not a simpleton, *could* misunderstand his language, when he says, Christ *as to His manhood* was the Lord from heaven? If so, will he be kind enough to point out any plainer or more intelligible language in Johnson's Dictionary? He ought to be ashamed of himself for saying any man could misunderstand such language.

So much for the preface. Now for the body of the book. Mr. Mackintosh spoke as true as the Gospel, when he called this a "guarded" edition. In place of leaving out the doctrine, he has "guarded" it so that a careless reader would imbibe the poison without being well aware he had done so. Hence the danger is the greater. If he had wished to leave out the doctrine, he would have expunged, at the very least, the whole of the second chapter; but in place of this, he has retained it all, except the following eight words:—"as to His manhood," "divine man," "heavenly man." When these words are omitted, the doctrine does not so readily catch the attention; but it is in no way altered. For example, pages 29 and 30, he says, "One consideration should weigh heavily in

the estimation of every Christian, and that is the vital nature of the doctrine of Christ's humanity ; it lies at the very foundation of Christianity ; and, for this reason, Satan has diligently sought, from the beginning, to lead people astray in reference to it. Almost all the leading errors which have found their way into the professing Church disclose the Satanic purpose to undermine the truth as to the person of Christ. . . . I feel called upon to warn the reader against strange sounds, in reference to the divine mystery of Christ's humanity. . . . It is to be feared that great looseness prevails in reference to this holy mystery." Is it not plain there is some special doctrine underlying this ? Recollect, it is not the divinity of Christ, but His humanity, he is speaking of. The humanity is the burden of this whole chapter. The question of His Godhead is not in discussion. It is all about the humanity. We are not warned against strange sounds concerning the divinity of Christ ; it all relates to His humanity. Now, what are the strange sounds on the *humanity* of Christ which have crept into the professing Church ? What is the doctrine on this point which Satan has been so active in introducing ? Where has the professing Christian Church gone astray on the *humanity* of Christ ? Where does the great looseness on this point prevail ? Is it not as plain as the light of Heaven that Mr. Mackintosh holds opinions regarding the humanity of Christ

different from those which are held by the professing Church? Is it not evident his views are not the same as those which he thinks Satan is diligently inculcating on professing Christians? No person can doubt this without charging Mr. Mackintosh with the high crime of wilfully misrepresenting the views of the professing Church. The Church is either going aside from the views it has been supposed honestly to entertain, or else Mr. Mackintosh thinks those views so erroneous that they are the inventions of Satan. I ask Christians, are they dishonest on this point? Do they really hold views on the humanity of Christ different from those they have hitherto professed? If not, Mr. Mackintosh must be falsely accusing them, *or else he considers the ordinarily received opinions to be the invention of Satan.* There cannot be the shadow of doubt that Mr. Mackintosh holds views entirely different from the generality of professing Christians on this point. Why then does he not state them in unmistakable terms? Why does he not honestly tell us the exact view which he says Satan is introducing? Why does he leave any possibility of doubt on such a momentous subject? Why has he "*guarded*" his present edition? If he wanted the truth to be known, there would be no need of guarding. He stated his views in the plainest possible language in the first edition of his book. Why has he altered it so now that his real opinions are *more* difficult to discover?

Why has he "guarded" in place of expunging? Why has he retained all the obnoxious views under a far more insidious, and, therefore, more dangerous form? If he has not changed his views, he should not have changed his words; and if he has changed his views, he should honestly tell us so. He should recant all his former sayings, and tell us plainly where he was wrong. As he has never done this, we are bound to suppose his views have undergone no change. He may think it prudent to render them somewhat ambiguous, or to hide them, but he has never recanted them.

It is also evident, from the extract I have given, that when Mr. Mackintosh speaks of the "person of Christ," he means the humanity, because it is on the humanity of Christ, or the person of Christ, that he says Satan is introducing the false doctrine. If this be kept distinctly in view in reading his works, it will be seen that he deifies the humanity in an immense number of instances. As I cannot find space to criticise the whole chapter, I will just take the paragraph from which I previously quoted, and from which Mr. Mackintosh has now omitted the words "as to His manhood." "As to the materials," says he, "the 'fine flour' may be regarded as the basis of the offering; and in it we have a type of Christ's humanity." Observe here, the question in the paragraph is the *humanity*, not the divinity, of Christ. "The Holy

Ghost," he continues, "delights to unfold the glories of Christ's person. . . . He contrasts Him with Adam, even in his very best and highest state. . . . The first Adam, even in his unfallen condition, was 'of the earth,' but the second Man was 'the Lord from heaven.'" We here see that when Mr. Mackintosh speaks of the glorious person of Christ, he means His humanity. The sense of the paragraph also demonstrates that it is the humanity of Christ Mr. M. is contrasting with Adam. There would be no sense at all in the paragraph if he meant the Godhead of Christ, because his whole argument relates to the humanity of Christ. Consequently, he must mean the "manhood" of Christ when he says He is "the Lord from heaven." No Christian will deny that, in His Godhead, Christ is the Lord from heaven. This point is not in dispute amongst Christians. Hence it cannot be the point which Mr. Mackintosh is labouring to set us right on. It is not on the divinity of Christ, but on "the vital nature of the doctrine of Christ's humanity," that he says professing Christians are so led away by Satan. It is this affair of the humanity he is trying to inculcate on his readers. It is, therefore, indisputable that he means the humanity of Christ when he calls Him "the Lord from heaven." He has made it more difficult for ordinary readers to unravel his meaning, but he has in no way altered the sense, by omitting, in the second edition, the expression "as to His man-

hood ;” and for that reason he should have allowed it to remain as he originally published it, “The second Man is, as to His manhood, the Lord from heaven.” When he holds the opinion, in place of truckling about it, he should stand manfully up for it.

Again, at page 36 of the guarded edition, we have the words, “The conception of Christ’s humanity, by the Holy Ghost, in the womb of the Virgin.” The doctrine creeps out here also. The Scripture says, “Behold, a virgin shall conceive ;” and again, “Thou shalt conceive in thy womb ;” but Mr. Mackintosh improves upon this, and says the conception, in place of being by the Virgin, was by the Holy Ghost. If the Holy Ghost conceived in her womb, it was not the Virgin herself that conceived. According to this view, the Virgin had no more to do with the conception than, as Valentine said, the conduit has with the water which runs through it. Some have tried, in writing to me, to get Mr. Mackintosh out of his difficulty by saying that both statements are true, namely, that the Holy Ghost conceived, and the Virgin conceived also ; but this idea is too absurd for any person of the least sense to entertain. It would make two conceptions—a double beginning, which is impossible. Besides, Mr. Mackintosh’s opinion derives no support from Scripture. He says the conception of the humanity was *by* the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin, whereas the first chapter of Matthew says,

"That which is conceived in her is *of* the Holy Ghost." These two statements are not the same ; and we can have no difficulty whatever in understanding the meaning of the expression, "Of the Holy Ghost," in Matthew, if we only look at the context. It is perfectly plain there that it was not the Holy Ghost conceived, and that the passage in no way contradicts the other Scriptures, which say that it was the Virgin herself conceived. "When Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost." So soon as Joseph knew she was with child, he determined to put her away, because he thought she was with child by whoredom ; but the angel put him right on this point, and assured him that, in place of being in child by man, she was in child by the power of the Most High—"for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost." That which she conceived was not of man, but of the Holy Ghost. There can be no difficulty here. The passage gives no support to Mr. Mackintosh's idea of the Holy Ghost conceiving, nor does it in any way contradict those Scriptures which say that the Virgin conceived. She was not found with child of man, but "she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. . . . That which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost"—not of man, because she knew not man. "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee ; therefore also that holy thing

which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."

Further, Mr. Mackintosh's views regarding the conception by the Holy Ghost are carried to their legitimate result, as we find him, page 40 of the guarded edition, saying, "Such was the *humanity* of Christ, that He could at any moment, as far as He was personally concerned, have returned to heaven, from whence He had come and to which He belonged." What is the meaning of this, reader? Does he mean that the humanity of Christ was such that the divinity could separate from it and return to heaven, whence it had come and to which it belonged? This cannot possibly be his meaning. He just means that Christ's humanity was such that He, humanity and divinity combined, could *return* to heaven, whence He had come and to which He belonged. Of course, if the humanity could return to heaven, as a matter of necessity it must have been there before: so that here again we have the heavenly humanity theory cropping up. Further, at page 42, he says, "Between humanity as seen in the Lord Jesus Christ, and humanity as seen in us, there could be no union. . . . The spiritual and the carnal, the heavenly and the earthly, could never combine. . . . At this side of death there could be no union between Christ and His people." Surely the heavenly humanity doctrine is plain enough here. Between humanity as seen in

Christ, and humanity as seen in us, there could be no union. His spiritual humanity could not unite with our carnal humanity; His heavenly humanity could not unite with our earthly humanity; His humanity which was conceived by the Holy Ghost—which was spiritual—could not unite with our humanity which was conceived by the daughters of Eve, and which consequently was not spiritual and heavenly, but carnal and earthly. I really feel it would be a waste of time to dwell much longer on this point. There is scarcely a page in his second chapter in which the doctrine of “the heavenly humanity” is not taught either directly or indirectly, either openly or “guardedly.”

Having traced the pernicious doctrine through the first and second editions of “Notes on Leviticus,” I must now see if it is to be found in the second *revised* edition of “Notes on Exodus.” On page 276, Christ is called “a heavenly man;” and on page 278, we are told the angel informed Mary that “divine power was about to form a real man—‘the second Man, the Lord from heaven.’” Here the real man—the *body* which was to be *formed* in Mary—is directly called the Lord from heaven. The sentence I have quoted also explicitly states that the *Lord from heaven* was about *to be formed* by divine power. This is rank Socinianism. At pages 281, 280, and 265, he says, Christ was “entirely heavenly,” was “a heavenly stranger,” and

"travelled from the eternal throne of God in heaven down to the depths of Calvary's cross." There are many other points, but I cannot now dwell on them.

There is a *third*, and *revised* edition of his "Notes on Genesis." What does it say? Preface, page 9, "There is no blessing outside of, or apart from, the *person* of Christ—the *heavenly Man*." Surely this needs to be "*guarded*." But there is one remarkable sentence on the 19th page, which needs to be doubly "*guarded*." It runs thus :—"Yes, my reader, the Lord Christ, God manifest in the flesh, the Lord of the Sabbath, the maker and sustainer of heaven and earth, spent the seventh day in the dark and silent tomb." If there be any meaning in language at all, Mr. Mackintosh here makes the *body* of Christ—the only part which lay in the tomb—completely God ; and this is in perfect accordance with the idea of the "*conception* by the Holy Ghost," the "*divine man*," the "*heavenly humanity*," the "*manhood*" which was "*the Lord from heaven*." If Mr. Mackintosh, in the words I have quoted, did not mean that the *body* of Christ, which lay in the grave, was really and truly God, or else that the humanity and the Godhead (impious thought !) both lay in the dark and silent tomb, he is as incapable of writing intelligibly as the new-born child.

SOCINIANISM.

THE great danger to be feared from the Plymouth Brethren arises from the fact, that they have ingeniously mixed up some very important truths with the most pernicious and fatal errors. This is often done in such a "guarded" manner that ordinary readers are not very likely to discover the combination till they have actually imbibed the poison. Hence the vast importance of discovering the errors and laying them open to the gaze of the Christian world. "In most of these combinations of scriptural truth with error (of which the apostles were very jealous)," says a foreign correspondent of the *London Record*, "instead of the good compensating for the evil, by neutralising it, as is often erroneously supposed, it rather increases the evil by helping to give it currency ; many proofs of which could be supplied from the history of the Christian Church."

"Greater zeal," says my father, in the fifth volume of his Works, "for the salvation of sinners, and the amelioration of the condition of human kind, never was manifested than at present. This is ground of rejoicing to all the friends of the Gospel. But there is one unhappy symptom of the present times, with respect to Christianity. Zeal for the *purity* of divine truth has not kept pace with zeal for the salvation of sinners. . . . Where now are the friends of ancient

orthodoxy? Are there not still multitudes who adhere to the strong views of truth professed by the Reformers? Will they quietly suffer a spurious liberality to rob them of the truth? Are they afraid to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints? Is it more important to propagate the Gospel, than to preserve its purity? Paul thought it of more importance to contend for the purity of the Gospel than to extend its reception by his personal ministry. He never laid down his weapons. He was unceasingly employed in combating the corruptions of the Gospel. All the zeal at present manifested by the Man of Sin, all the efforts of Atheism, are not so much to be dreaded as the present apathy among Christians regarding the integrity and purity of divine truth. If judgment shall be executed upon the house of God, this base acquiescence in the subversion of the Gospel, by false philosophy and false charity, will be the bitterest ingredient in the cup of suffering."

In the previous chapter, I quoted an extract from the *Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*, which stated that the Plymouth Brethren were propagating the Socinian view of some of the sacrifices. As this point is in discussion between Mr. Darby and the Editor of the *Journal*, I shall not dwell upon it. But still, I find so many things in Mr. Mackintosh's book which, to my judgment, smell strongly of Socinian doctrine, that I cannot altogether pass on without pointing out some

of them to my readers. Let us look at Mr. Mackintosh's view of the burnt-offering; and to give him full fair play, I shall quote from his "guarded" edition of "Notes on Leviticus."

At page 6, he says, "The primary aspect of Christ's work was to God-ward. It was an ineffable delight to Him to accomplish the will of God on earth." In my early days I came greatly in contact with Unitarians and Socinians, and I almost think I can yet hear them uttering similar words to these. The work was to obey and please God—not to obey and make atonement in the room and stead of the sinner. Again, page 7, "In all this self-emptying devotedness to God, there was truly a sweet savour. A perfect Man on the earth accomplishing the will of God even in death, was an object of amazing interest to the mind of Heaven." Unitarianism and Socinianism are not yet dead. The perfect Man accomplished the will of God, and obeyed Him as the antitype of the burnt-offering, but not in the room and stead of the sinner! Further, page 10, "Christ, in the burnt-offering, was exclusively for the eye and heart of God. This point should be distinctly apprehended." Abraham "took the ram," says the Scripture, "and offered him up for a burnt-offering in the stead of his son." Is there no substitution here? *In the stead of his son.* Job "offered a burnt-offering according to the number of them all: for Job said, It may be my sons have sinned." The

inspired penman tells us Job offered the burnt-offering for the *sins* of his sons ; but Mr. Mackintosh, it is to be presumed under "the presidency of the Spirit," is enabled to tell us that it was not for sin at all, but "exclusively for the eye and heart of God," that Christ appeared in the burnt-offering. The sinner had neither part nor lot in this part of Christ's work. It was merely to please God without any apparent cause. Does it not approach to the borders of blasphemy to suppose God required all this without any relation to the bearing of the sins of His people, as if He were as capricious as one of the gods of the heathen ? "The burnt-offering," continues Mr. M., page 11, "does not foreshadow Christ on the cross *bearing sin*, but Christ on the cross accomplishing the will of God." Is there a Socinian in the world would refuse to subscribe to this doctrine ? If there is, I never saw one like him. Again, page 17, "The cross, in the burnt-offering, is not the exhibition of the exceeding hatefulness of sin, but of Christ's unshaken and unshakable devotedness to the Father ?" Would the Socinian not join in this, and say it had nothing to do with atonement for sin ; but was to please God and show Christ's devotedness to the Father ? To be sure he would. But to crown all, Mr. Mackintosh says, page 20, "The idea of sin-bearing—the imputation of sin—the wrath of God—does not appear in the burnt-offering. True," he continues, "we read, 'It shall be accepted for him to

make atonement for him ;' but then it is 'atonement' not according to the depths and enormity of human guilt, but according to the perfection of Christ's surrender of Himself to God, and the intensity of God's delight in Christ." What great sin was there in Christ's surrender of Himself to the Father, and in the Father's delight in the Son, that thus required to be atoned for? Is it not sufficient to terrify any Christian to read such sentiments? Just think of the hardihood of the man who will thus deal with Scripture. When Revelation says, "He shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt-offering, and it shall be accepted for *him* to make *atonement* for *him*," Mr. Mackintosh gives a flat contradiction, and informs us it is not an atonement for him at all—it has nothing to do with sin-bearing—nothing to do with the enormity of human guilt—but is only an atonement, "according to the perfection of Christ's surrender of Himself to God, and the intensity of God's delight in Christ!" Leaving the awful impiety of this method of handling Scripture out of the question altogether, there is not even one particle of sense in Mr. Mackintosh's statement. How could Christ make an atonement for "the perfection of Christ's surrender of Himself to God, and the intensity of God's delight in Christ?" Did any man ever before hear such a jargon of nonsense, with a deep purpose to mystify Scripture? This is so well "guarded," that I am sure

Mr. Mackintosh himself could not explain it. It is about on a par with the old woman's definition of metaphysics, "which the writer didna understan' himsel', and which nae other body kenned."

Such are the sentiments on the burnt-offering which are taught in the "guarded" edition of the "Notes on Leviticus." They are also to be found at the 202d and 203d pages of the first volume of "Things New and Old," where it says, "Christ, as the antitype of the burnt-offering, gave up His life, in order to give full expression to His devotedness. . . . The burnt-offering prefigures Christ on the cross, *not as a sin-bearer*, but as accomplishing the will of God. . . . It does not set forth the hatefulness of sin, but the preciousness and divine excellency of Christ, and His devotedness to God, even unto death."

I do not wish it to be understood, by anything I have stated, that Mr. Mackintosh denies a full atonement for sin on the cross. What I charge him with is, that he says the part of Christ's work on the cross which was typified by the burnt-offering had no relation to the sinner at all. There can be no mistake about his opinions on this point. He has not yet "guarded" them. He says, "Christ, in the burnt-offering, was *exclusively* for the eye and heart of God. . . . The burnt-offering does not foreshadow Christ on the cross *bearing sin*, but Christ on the cross accomplishing the will of God. . . . The idea of sin-bearing—the imputa-

tion of sin—the wrath of God—does not appear in the burnt-offering.” According to this view, there is one portion, or aspect, of Christ’s work on the cross which has nothing at all to do with the sins of His people. It has no relation to His chosen ones. In whose stead, then, is He standing? If in every portion of this work He is not standing in the place of the sinner, for whom is He atoning? Job offered the burnt-offering for the sins of his sons; consequently Christ, *as the antitype of that offering*, must have been offered for some person’s sins. For whom, then, was He offered? For Himself, or for others? As Mr. Mackintosh utterly denies it was for the sins of His people—that there was any imputation in the matter—he should just go the whole length of saying it was on His own account. He admits it was an atonement. For whom was the atonement effected? If it was not effected for His people, it must have been for Himself. Mr. M. tells us it was “*atonement*, not according to the depths and enormity of human guilt, but according to the perfection of Christ’s surrender of Himself to God.” If it was really an atonement, it must have been for sin; and if it was not for the sins of His people imputed to Him, it must have been on His own account. This is the fair, legitimate, and necessary result of Mr. M.’s representations of Christ as the antitype of the burnt-offering.

I am persuaded there is not a Socinian in the world

would find fault with Mr. Mackintosh's opinions about the burnt-offering. "This attack upon the burnt-offering," says the *Journal of Prophecy*, "is, perhaps, one of the worst of their errors. For that sacrifice is the great parent of all the other sacrifices—the root from which the others have sprung as branches. If, then, the Socinian axe be laid to the parent root and stem, the whole tree with all its branches must come down. . . . It requires no common amount of prepossession and hardihood to deny a propitiatory character to the burnt-offering. . . . We could not have believed that any but a Socinian or a Rationalist could have so entirely set aside the great features of the burnt-offering. . . . Those who have gone thus far will have no difficulty in going farther. . . . The heresy is a serious one, and strikes at the very root of redemption. It is the theory of Maurice and Socinus in an evangelical form."

The Socinian tendency of Plymouthism is further shown by Mr. Darby's new translation of the Scriptures. As I have not seen that work myself, I take my authority from an article in "The Sword and Trowel" for December 1872. "Mr. Darby," observes the reviewer, "says in his preface, 'I have not a doubt of the justness of the change, and just because, in *modern* English, worship is used for what is rendered to God only. When the English translation was made, it was not, and the use of it now falsifies the sense in

three-quarters of the passages it is used in. It is quite certain that in the vast majority of instances of persons coming to the Lord they had not the least idea of owning Him as God. And it falsifies the sense in a material point to use the word now.' This," continues the reviewer, "is Mr. Darby's language, and it is clear enough, at all events, nor could anything more decided on the subject be said by the most advanced Unitarian minister in London. He says, 'in modern English worship is used for God only.' This is one statement ; and then, 'in the vast majority of instances, they had not the least idea of owning Christ as God.' This is the next statement ; and further, 'it falsifies the sense on a material point so to use the word now.' This is the third ; and consequently, as worship is for God only, and in the vast majority of cases they had not the least idea of owning Christ as God, Christ did not get worship at all, but only homage, and so Mr. Darby was quite right in putting in his Bible homage and not worship. . . . Verily if Gilbert Wakefield, Priestly, or Belsham were alive, these leading Unitarian ministers would say, 'Let us shake hands, brother !' Yet these are the grounds on which Mr. Darby thinks proper to sweep the worship of Christ out of the New Testament ! . . . Again, why does Mr. Darby not allow the capital letters to remain as before to the names of our Lord and of the Holy Ghost ? These words in the common French version begin with capital letters, but

Mr. Darby expunges the capitals and puts small letters instead. Thus, in his version, *seigneur*, Lord, is printed with a small s, and *saint esprit*, Holy Ghost, with a small s. All this, observe, is done coolly and deliberately."

We here see a most deliberate attempt to overturn the Deity of Christ. In place of being worshipped, He only received homage, because God only is to be worshipped; and in place of having His title, Lord, written with a capital letter, He must be reduced to the level of a man, and have the title written with a small l, as in lord. And yet this is the man who calls himself a Christian. This is the man who is able to tell us that the wise men from the East (Matt. ii.), in place of coming to worship Jesus, only came to pay Him homage—that the disciples (Matt. xiv.), when they came and worshipped Him, saying, "Of a truth Thou art the Son of God," did not worship Him at all, but only paid Him homage—that Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, and the eleven disciples (Matt. xxviii.), did not worship Him, but only paid Him homage, for worship is for God only—that the disciples, on seeing the Lord go up into heaven (Luke xxiv.), merely paid Him homage, because worship is for God only—and that the blind man who was healed (John ix.), in place of saying, "Lord, I believe; and he worshipped Him," should have said, "lord, worship is due to God only, I will not worship thee, but I will

pay thee homage." Christian reader, what do you now think of the Socinian tendencies of Darby and Mackintosh? What do you now think of the truthfulness of Mrs. Grattan Guinness, when she asserts that "on the fundamental truths of the gospel," these Plymouths "are at one with all evangelical denominations?" Is there a single evangelical denomination in the empire which denies true worship to Jesus in the New Testament; or that the burnt-offering prefigures Christ on the cross bearing the sins of His people?

THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST.

THERE are few questions of more importance than the one which has reference to the way in which a sinner becomes perfectly righteous before God. If he be not completely righteous, he cannot enter heaven. When man fell from his pristine sinless condition, he could not of himself procure a righteousness. He therefore required a substitute who was able both to keep the law and to suffer the penalty for its breach. It is of the utmost importance to understand the distinction between obeying the law and suffering its penalty. Suffering the penalty can never bring innocence. If a man obeys the laws of his country in every particular, he is innocent; but if he has committed a breach, and is brought to trial, he must be pronounced guilty. Being once guilty, he can never be made innocent by

suffering the punishment. For example, a man who has committed murder may suffer death as the penalty of his crime, but no person would think of him as innocent. Even the royal pardon, which would save him from the punishment, could not make him guiltless. So is it with the sinner. He has broken the laws of God, and cannot save himself. If he is to be saved, it must be by the instrumentality of one who is able to render perfect obedience to every precept of the law, as well as to suffer its penalty. In both these points, the saved sinner has a perfect substitute in Christ. Christ "took not on Him the nature of angels ; but He took on Him the seed of Abraham"—our humanity—and in the room and stead of His people, He lived a life of complete and perfect obedience to every possible demand of the law which they were required to keep ; and then, in His death, He paid the full and entire penalty of the law which they had broken. In this way He wrought out a complete robe of righteousness for His Church. The law was kept, and the penalty paid ; and the saved sinner entered heaven perfectly righteous when viewed by God in His all-sufficient substitute Christ Jesus.

"In the plan of salvation through Christ," says my father, "the authority of the law is fully vindicated, and the breach of it fully avenged. Not only so, but its demands are fully yielded in the obedience of the life of the sinner's substitute. Saved sinners have

given the law what damned sinners will never give it. *In the substitute they have rendered full obedience to its precepts and suffered the full penalty of its breach.* Instead of trampling on the law, in the salvation of His people from its curse, Christ has magnified the law and made it honourable. Is it possible for God more highly to honour the law than to exact obedience to it from His Son, and to demand from Him full satisfaction for its breach by His people? This is more honourable to the law than if it never had been broken. It is more honourable to it than if all its transgressors had suffered for ever in hell. The obedience of the Son of God to its precepts, and His enduring of its curse in His death, are the highest possible honour that the law can receive. . . The law was broken by the first Adam, but it was fulfilled by the second. Its requirements were perfectly yielded by the obedience of the life of Christ, and its penalty was suffered by His death. This, then, is the ground on which rests the character which God gives of Himself to Moses. In Christ only can this character be true. Here the various divine attributes have their perfect operation. Here God is merciful without clearing the guilty. His mercy provides an almighty Saviour to pay the debt in their nature: He does not clear the guilty, because, in acquitting them, they are acquitted as *innocent*. They have suffered the penalty of the law in Christ: they have fully kept the precepts of the

law in Christ. This way of harmonising the divine attributes is perfect wisdom. Yet, so far is it removed from the wisdom of men that human wisdom cannot receive it on God's testimony. It is always endeavouring to harmonise the divine attributes by a compromise, or by giving an ascendancy to mercy. As they stand in Christ, His people are not guilty. They are purer than the heavens. It would be a false judgment that would pronounce them guilty, as they are one with Christ. They do not deserve punishment. Their punishment would be as much opposed to justice as to mercy. Here the mercy of God looks the law of God in the face, and without a blush it delivers the prisoner. This wonderful plan of harmonising the divine attributes is here revealed, not as opposed to the law, but as rendering the law complete obedience. Here the divine glory shines in all its lustre."—"Carson's Works," vol. v. pp. 121, 171.) When Christ obeyed all the precepts of the law in His life, and endured the entire punishment due to our sins in His death, He provided a perfect righteousness of His own, which is imputed to us. As we are one with Christ in His life, in the keeping of the law, and one with Him in His death, in suffering the penalty of the law, we are completely free and perfectly righteous. We have no righteousness of our own. We get it, by imputation, from Christ.

What saith the Scripture on this point? "And

their righteousness is of Me, saith the Lord. . . . He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation ; He hath covered me with the robe of righteousness. . . . Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works. . . . That righteousness might be imputed unto them also. . . . For the marriage of the Lamb is come, and His wife [the Church] hath made herself ready. And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white ; for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints. . . . But of Him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption. . . . For if by one man's offence death reigned by one ; much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by One, Jesus Christ. . . . For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." The imputation of Christ's righteousness to His people is here taught as plainly as words could teach it. Their righteousness is not their own ; it is said to be of the Lord. They are covered with the robe of righteousness. God is said to *impute* righteousness without works. The Church, the Lamb's bride, is arrayed in fine linen, which is the righteousness of saints. Christ is distinctly said to be *unto us* wisdom, *righteousness*, sanctification, and redemption ; so that if we have not

His righteousness, we have not His redemption. But to place the matter beyond every possibility of dispute, we are informed that, as by the disobedience of the first Adam many were made sinners, so by the obedience of the last Adam many shall be made righteous. This doctrine is stated in the words of inspiration as clear as the light of heaven.

Now, what do the Darbyites say on this question? In order to prevent misunderstanding on the part of my readers, I must here mention that the point between them and us is not the long-disputed question of the *imputation* of righteousness, but their total denial of the righteousness of *Christ* as a doctrine of Scripture. The last point is the thing to be considered. They admit the imputation of righteousness, but deny that there is such a thing at all as the righteousness of Christ in the whole compass of revelation. This is such a dreadful and soul-destroying heresy, that I would not charge them with holding it if there was the slightest doubt about their opinions on the subject. From the thoroughly jesuitical way in which they often speak of righteousness, many parties imagine they are quite sound, but their heterodoxy is rendered indisputable by the following proofs. "It is very remarkable," says Mr. C. Stanley, "that the Scriptures never use the expression, 'the imputed righteousness of Christ,' or even 'the righteousness of Christ'; but always the 'righteousness of God.' . . . The words,

the 'righteousness of God,' do not mean the 'righteousness of Christ.'"—("Imputed Righteousness," pp. 1, 6.) It is here very plainly stated that what is called in Scripture "the righteousness of God," is not "the righteousness of Christ." There can be no doubt this is the doctrine asserted. And Mr. Mackintosh says, "I would observe here, that in speaking of the 'imputation of righteousness,' I by no means desire to be understood as giving any countenance to the prevailing theory of 'the imputed righteousness of Christ.' . . . Of this expression, so much in use in the theology of the present day, it would be sufficient to say that it is nowhere to be found in the oracles of God. I read," he continues, "of 'the righteousness of God;' and, moreover, of the *imputation* of righteousness, but *never* of the *righteousness of Christ.*"—"Tribe of Levi," third edition, p. 33.) The *imputation* of the righteousness of God is here distinctly held, whilst it is most emphatically denied that the oracles of God contain such a thing as the righteousness of *Christ*. Again, "to the believer now," says Mr. Bell, "righteousness is imputed without works. How? Through the righteousness of Christ? The Scripture *does not say so.* . . . You (Mr. Cox) complain of the many points of difference which exist between 'Brethren' and others—all, I own, material points. But whence these differences? They are all involved in this question of justification."—"Cease ye from Man," pp. 16, 24.)

The righteousness which is imputed to the believer is here denied to be the righteousness of Christ ; and it is admitted that justification through the righteousness of Christ is a fundamental point on which the Plymouths dissent from other sects. It is one of the cardinal questions. And yet Mrs. Grattan Guinness does not hesitate to state that "on the fundamental truths of the gospel" the Plymouths "are at one with all evangelical denominations." If this be not misleading the public, I know not what is.

What do the Darbyites mean by "the righteousness of God," which they say is imputed to the believer ? They just mean one of the *attributes* of the Godhead. "The righteousness spoken of here" (Rom. iii.), says Mr. Bell, "is evidently the righteousness of the Godhead—that essential attribute."—"Cease ye from Man," p. 15.) "It is very remarkable," observes Mr. C. Stanley, "that the Scriptures never use the expression, 'The righteousness of Christ,' but always, as in Rom. iii. 19, 26, 'The righteousness of God.' The Holy Ghost must have an object in this ; and surely it is to direct our attention first of all to God himself, to show His own *character* and *attributes* in perfect consistency and harmony, that He is *just* in justifying the sinner. . . . It is of the first importance that God should be seen to be perfectly consistent with Himself, in the *relation* in which He stands to all created beings, and *this is righteousness*. . . . The subject of the first

eight chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, is the unfolding *the righteous character* of God in condemning sin, yet justifying the believing sinner.”—(“Imputed Righteousness,” pp. 1-3.) “It is not the righteousness of God, *a fact, an existing thing*, which is spoken of,” says Mr. Darby, “but righteousness of God—*this quality of righteousness*.”—(“The Righteousness of God,” p. 14.) Righteousness is here made the inherent quality, or attribute, which belongs to the Godhead. Again, pages 18, 19, and 28, Mr. Darby says, “The righteousness of God means, first of all, His own righteousness—that He is just. . . . The righteousness spoken of is God’s being righteous (*just* is the same word). . . . We have gained an immense point in understanding that God’s righteousness is the *quality* or character that is in God Himself. . . . God’s righteousness is His perfect consistency with His own perfect and blessed nature.” Again, “That in the Old Testament,” says Mr. Darby, “the Lord’s righteousness means a *quality* in the *character* of God, is beyond all question or controversy. Is it different wholly in the New? *I do not believe it.*”—(“The Pauline Doctrine,” p. 16.)

These extracts demonstrate beyond question from any rational being, that what the Darbyites call the righteousness of God is a quality inherent in God Himself—*is one of the divine attributes*. Now, inasmuch as they hold the imputation of the righteous-

ness of God, if this righteousness be, as Mr. Darby says, "the *quality* or character that is in God Himself,"—if it thus be one of the *attributes* of the Almighty, I demand to know how this attribute of the Godhead is to be *imputed* to man. Just think of the interpretation of Scripture which compels them to hold that some of the attributes of the Almighty are to be imputed to man! I demand a rational explanation of this point. I ask how man is to be *clothed* with an attribute of the Godhead? Let them explain this if they can. No doubt God possesses righteousness as one of His attributes, but this is not the righteousness which is imputed to man. It could not be so; the attributes of the Godhead are not conferred on the human race. I call on Mr. C. Stanley to show how his statement could be true, when he asserts that "God's *own essential righteousness* is communicated to us."—"Justification," by the Rev. John Harrison, p. 31.) Will God endow us with His own attributes? "Even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe." This righteousness cannot be the attribute of divinity, because by faith it is *unto* all and *upon* all that believe. Man is not converted into a God after this fashion. As Mr. Haldane has well observed, "The righteousness of God, which is received by faith, denotes something that becomes the property of the believer. It cannot, then, be here the divine

attribute of justice, but the divine work which God has wrought through His Son. This, therefore, determines the phrase, in this place, as referring immediately, not to the divine attribute, but to the divine work. The former never can become ours."

To those who are really acquainted with the views of these Plymouths, my dwelling so long on the proof of this point may appear superfluous ; and so it would be, were it not that many half-hearted supporters of truth are so fond of cloaking error, that they try to make us believe the Plymouths do not hold "the righteousness of God" as an attribute of the Godhead. They are disposed to argue that the "Brethren" do not believe what they say. If they would only think for a moment, however, they would see it is easy to prove that this must be the opinion of the Darbyites, even although they had been a little more "guarded" in giving expression to this peculiar view. For example, Mr. C. Stanley not only tells us, that the words, "the righteousness of God," *do not mean* the righteousness of Christ ; but he also says, "The thought of Christ having kept the law for me, and that this is imputed to me for righteousness, even supposing I had been a Jew under law, would be utterly wrong. . . . Nor does the Scripture anywhere teach the whole life of Christ as keeping the law, imputed to, or put upon the law-breaker, to enable him to stand in law-kept righteousness before God."—"Imputed Righteousness," p. 6.)

Now, I ask those would-be apologists for the Plymouths, what they make of this? If Christ hath not kept the law in the room of His people; if He hath not worked out a righteousness for them; if the righteousness of God be not the righteousness of Christ, what else can it be than an attribute of the Godhead? If it be not this, what is it? If the righteousness of God be not the righteousness of Christ; if Christ hath not worked it out, it must surely be an attribute of divinity. Will any one say it was worked out for us by the Father? Consequently, if the Father did not work it out, and if it be not the righteousness of Christ, it could not have been worked out at all, and must, in the very nature of things, be an original and inherent attribute of the Almighty. This is the inevitable result; and it lies on those who hold such views to show how it is possible for God to *impute* His own attributes to the human race. If one attribute can be imputed, all the attributes can be imputed, and men can all be turned into Gods.

Since this work was first published, I have read Mr. Darby's dismally dark reply to the *Journal of Prophecy*. I see he has taken another turn for the purpose of getting out of the perplexing position in which he is placed. He says, p. 14, "Righteousness being imputed to a man, simply means the man being accounted righteous. It does not mean a quantum of formal righteousness outside us, imputed to us, but our

being accounted righteous." Now, what sort of imputation is this? It is no imputation at all. He should cease to use the expression, "Imputed righteousness," altogether. He is only misleading the public by using language to which he attaches a different meaning from what it is able to bear. If this system of "guarding" be not dropped, it must just be exposed. It is a complete deception. According to the turn Mr. D. has now taken, the righteousness is not imputed at all, but the man who is not righteous is accounted righteous. The God of truth and justice is to come forth with a lie in His right hand, and to account the man righteous who is not, in any sense, truly righteous—to call the thief an honest man!! How can that man call himself a Christian who will make a just and holy God the author of a falsehood, by accounting an unrighteous man righteous? If God accounts a man anything but what he really and truly is, He denies Himself and ceases to be God. It is impossible for God to lie, and, therefore, the man who is accounted righteous by God must, indeed, be really and truly righteous in the sense in which God accounts him so. There can be no *if* or *and* in the matter. Although personally a sinner, the believer has the righteousness of Christ so really and truly imputed to him, that he is as innocent, standing in Christ, as if he never had sinned, and as spotless as the throne of the Almighty. Again, if the righteousness be not the righteousness

of Christ, but is one of the attributes of the Godhead, as the Darbyites make it, I want to know how the attribute of the Godhead is to be "accounted" to man. This is the point. If Mr. D. had one particle of perspicacity, he would see that he has not advanced a single step towards relief from his predicament. It is just as impossible for an attribute of the Godhead to be *accounted* to man as to be imputed to man. God's attributes can neither be accounted nor imputed to man.

But Mr. Darby goes on to say, "God accounts us righteous because of the work of Christ." As Mr. D. is about as confused a writer as ever put pen to paper, this idea may probably satisfy his own understanding, but it could not satisfy any man who is capable of thinking clearly. Just look at it. The attribute of righteousness which belongs to the Godhead of Christ cannot be imputed or accounted to any man. Indeed, Mr. D. does not *here* say it could. He says it is for the *work* of Christ we are accounted righteous. Now, for what work are we accounted righteous? The paying of the penalty in the death of Christ is an essential ingredient in righteousness, but it alone does not constitute righteousness. The man who is righteous is entirely *innocent*. Suffering the punishment can never bring innocence. Consequently there must be a perfect obedience in the room of the guilty, as well as an atonement. But Mr. D. utterly denies the obedience of Christ's life in the room of His people. Where,

then, can he find the completion of righteousness? Nowhere. His view of the work of Christ cannot produce it. He makes Him pay the penalty for His people, but he does not make Him fulfil the law for His people. Hence there is no righteousness at all to be either imputed or accounted to His people. It is only a part of a righteousness. It is not complete. Mr. Darby's principles are dreadful. They make the God of heaven account a man innocent when he is not truly innocent—they make the holy God the author of a fiction!

Another idea here strikes me. Take Mr. Darby on his *own showing*, and what is the result? He says we are accounted righteous for the *work of Christ*. If so, the work of Christ must constitute a righteousness! and what is this but a righteousness of Christ, which he lustily denies? Further, if the righteousness which Mr. Darby says is accounted to us be constituted of the work of Christ, as he affirms, how does this work of Christ become an attribute of the Godhead? Absurd! At one time Mr. Darby says, "Righteousness is here made the inherent quality, or attribute, which belongs to the Godhead,"—an attribute inseparable from divinity; and then, in another place, when driven into a corner, he is obliged to acknowledge that the righteousness which is accounted to us results from the work of Christ. And still he denies there is such a thing as the righteousness of Christ! Verily

there is no end to the inconsistencies and contradictions of error. Again, if the work of Christ constitutes a righteousness, how does Mr. Darby venture to say that "the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ is not spoken of as to justification at all, and has nothing to do with the subject?" If the righteousness of Christ has nothing to do with justification, how are we justified by the work of Christ, which Mr. D. says is accounted to us? Truly such inconsistencies are inconsistent enough even for the authors of Plymouthism. In his reply to Mr. Trench, Mr. Darby complains that he cannot give intelligence to his adversaries. It would be a great blessing, however, if he could by any means obtain the least possible trifle of it for himself. No man in the world has more need of it.

I was told, a few days since, that it is impossible for the obedience of Christ to be so imputed that the man who has broken the law becomes entirely innocent. If so, I reply, on the same principle of reasoning, It is impossible for the work of Christ on the cross to be so imputed that the man becomes entirely free from his guilt. If the one be impossible, so is the other. In commenting on this, Mr. Darby says, "With a man who can reason thus, it is lost time to reason at all. There is not a particle of sense in the passage. An innocent man is, to go no deeper, a man who has never been guilty; and his ever becoming innocent is simple nonsense." Not so fast, Mr. Darby. Your

argument here, in place of making a fool of Dr. Carson, just proves your own incapacity, if you had the brains to see it. At the 45th page of your "Righteousness and Law," you say your sin is put away by the atonement, and you are "*guiltless*." Now, to turn your own argument on yourself; "With a man who can reason thus, it is lost time to reason at all. There is not a particle of sense in the passage. A *guiltless* man is, to go no deeper, a man who never has been guilty; and his ever becoming *guiltless* is simple nonsense." Verily, Mr. Darby, if you had the least critical power, you would have seen the predicament you were placing yourself in. On Mr. Darby's principles no man could be saved. It is very satisfactory to know, however, that the Scriptures place the matter in a different light. They tell us very plainly that "God imputeth righteousness without works;" that we are actually "clothed with the garments of salvation," and "covered with the robe of righteousness;" and that Christ is "made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." If the Plymouth views were correct, the redemption would be sufficient, and the robe of righteousness which God has provided is quite superfluous. They are far wiser than God. They can take men into heaven who are in no sense of the word innocent! Innocence can never result from suffering the punishment. The man who was hanged yesterday has undergone the full punishment for his

crimes—he has paid the penalty ; but if he were to come alive again to-morrow, he would possess no more innocence than he did the day before his execution. He might laugh at the hangman, but he could not get clear of the guilt. He might escape the repetition of punishment, but he could never proclaim his innocence. He could never use the language of Scripture, and say, “ Who shall lay anything to my charge ? ” He is still a real murderer, and is chargeable with the guilt of his crime. He cannot in any sense be looked on as innocent. Paying the penalty can never bring innocence. That cannot result without perfect obedience. So it is with the sinner. Christ paid the penalty on the cross by suffering the entire punishment, but that alone does not bring innocence or freedom from guilt, and alone could not admit to heaven. The man who enters heaven is in such a condition that *nothing whatever can be laid to his charge*. Although guilty in himself, he is completely innocent or guiltless when viewed in Christ. In Christ he is so perfect that God can see nothing amiss. The perfect obedience of Christ’s life and the complete atonement effected by His death on the cross, are both really and truly imputed to the saved sinner, and he thus enters heaven in a perfectly pure and spotless condition. He is innocent or guiltless.

No man but a polytheist could believe in a multitude of Gods. It is utterly impossible for men to be

converted into Gods by having the attributes of the Godhead imputed, imparted, or accounted to them. God cannot give away His own attributes. He cannot either impute, impart, or account His attributes of omnipotence, omnipresence, justice, omniscience, and eternity to the human race. Consequently that justice or righteousness, which is an attribute of divinity, cannot be given to man. If, then, God's attribute of righteousness cannot be imputed or accounted to man ; if there be no such thing in Scripture as the righteousness of Christ, and if man cannot possibly work out a righteousness for himself, how is he to get into heaven? This is a vital question. If Plymouthism be true, no person who was once a sinner ever entered heaven, or else heaven is peopled with *unrighteous* creatures. I defy any man to adopt their principles, and escape this difficulty. Their heaven is not the place where a righteous God dwells. It is filled with unrighteous people, and God could not look on them without abhorrence. Such views are entirely subversive of the Gospel.

As this point is of overwhelming importance, I will repeat my statement. When Christ suffered on the cross, He endured the entire punishment for the sins of His people ; He paid the penalty in their room and stead ; but this *alone* does not make them righteous. The man who is righteous is perfectly innocent. He not only defies punishment, but nothing whatever can

be laid to his charge. Suffering the penalty can never bring innocence. Palmer has suffered the penalty due to his crimes, but no human being could look on him now as being innocent or righteous. No sane man would say it is as impossible to lay anything to his charge now as if he never had committed the crime. The suffering of Christ on the cross was an essential ingredient in the righteousness of His people, because nothing could make them righteous till the penalty of the broken law was paid ; but, inasmuch as they must be made perfectly innocent, it was absolutely necessary that Christ should also keep the law in their room and stead. When, in their place, He both obeyed the law and paid the penalty, He brought them into a condition of perfect innocence. They were then completely righteous and meet for heaven. But how is it on the view of the Darbyites? They deny that Christ obeyed the law for His people ; they say there is no such thing in Scripture as the righteousness of Christ ; they deny that man can work a righteousness for himself ; they cannot show that suffering the punishment makes a man guiltless ; and they cannot prove that God can part with His own attribute of righteousness, in order to clothe man with it ; consequently all men must be excluded from that heaven wherein dwelleth righteousness. The heaven of these Plymouths is neither the heaven nor the hell of the Scriptures. It is an unholy place, and filled with half-saved people.

Again, whether viewed as transgressors in Adam, or, as personal transgressors, we must admit that we have broken the law of God, and are not now able to obey its precepts. If, then, man cannot obey the law on his own behalf, and if, as these Plymouths stoutly assert, Christ hath not obeyed it in his stead, I want to know what is to become of him. He must certainly be excluded from heaven, or else heaven is to be filled with those who are still transgressors. Suffering the punishment of the broken law, is not fulfilling its requirements and obeying its precepts. Hence, if the death of Christ alone be available for the believer—if the obedience of His life be excluded—His people must be excluded from the habitation of a just and holy God, because they are still under the stigma of a broken law. The law has not been kept by them nor by any substitute on their behalf, and, therefore, they cannot produce a full claim to the mansions of glory. Perhaps these Plymouths would attempt to escape from this predicament by asserting that we are not under law. Let them do so, and I at once reply, If we are not under law to God, and if Christ hath rendered no obedience to law for us, we cannot in any sense be guilty of the sin of disobedience, and consequently there was not the slightest necessity for an atonement. "Where no law is," saith the Scripture, "there is no transgression." If there was no law to be kept by man, or by a substitute in his stead, there was no law

to break, and there could be no atonement for its breach. This is self-evident. This view not only renders the obedience of Christ's life superfluous, but it also makes the atonement effected by His death unnecessary and useless.

Is it true, as asserted by Mr. Mackintosh, that we never read in Scripture of "the righteousness of Christ?" "Now," says the *Journal of Prophecy*, "suppose this were true—was not Christ God? It looks almost as if it were going to be denied that *Christ is God*. If Christ be God, then His righteousness is God's righteousness. Does any secret questioning of Christ's supreme Godhead lurk under the singular idea of His righteousness?" It is the righteousness of God in contradistinction to anything which could be done by men or angels. "For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." In the first of these verses, it is called the righteousness of God, in direct contrast to the righteousness of man, which man was trying to establish. There is no contrast here, regarding righteousness, between the Father and the Son, but there is a contrast between God and man. In the one case it is the righteousness established by man, in the other it is the righteousness provided by God. It must also be

specially remarked that what is called the righteousness of God, in the first part of the quotation, is called, in the last part, the righteousness of Christ. He is here said to be the end, or complete fulfilment, of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. Besides, if Christ be God, His righteousness is God's righteousness, and has a perfect right to be so called. No man can consistently deny this who admits the divinity of Christ.

“I will raise unto David a righteous Branch. . . . And this is His name whereby He shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.” It is beyond my comprehension how these Plymouths can believe this to be Scripture, and still say, We read of the righteousness of God, but never of the righteousness of Christ. They should cut this text out of the Bible. Surely the righteous Branch which is to be raised unto David is no other than Christ. He it is, then, who is to be called the Lord our Righteousness. No man of sense could argue that the righteousness here mentioned is the righteousness of the Father. It unquestionably applies to Christ; and the name whereby He shall be called is the Lord our Righteousness. It is evident the righteousness here referred to is not the essential attribute of righteousness which Christ possessed in His Godhead, because it is to be *our* righteousness. He cannot part with His own attributes, and, consequently, the righteousness which is to become ours, must be a righteousness which He could work out and

confer upon us. The attribute of righteousness, which belonged essentially to His Godhead, could no more become ours than could His attributes of omnipotence, omnipresence, and eternity. If these Plymouths, in claiming the attribute of God's righteousness, would be consistent, and also claim the attributes of omnipotence and omniscience, they would soon be consigned to Bedlam. The attributes of the Godhead cannot be conferred upon man. Jeremiah had not heard of these Plymouthites, for he tells us that Christ shall be called the LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.

“And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now ; for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.” What was the righteousness which Christ was fulfilling here in His baptism ? Was it one of His own attributes ? How could He *fulfil* His own attributes ? He might prove that He possessed them, but He could not fulfil them. The views of these Plymouths regarding righteousness are not consistent with either Scripture or common sense.

“Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works.” This is a most important portion of God's Word. It clearly establishes that God really and truly *imputes* righteousness to man. There is no sham either in the righteousness or in the imputation. The righteousness is a true righteousness, and no mockery ; and the imputation is real, not pretended.

When God says He imputes righteousness, He means what He says. He does not count a thing which never happens. There is no fictitious work with Him. When we are told (Rom. iii. 22), "The righteousness of God is *upon* all who believe," we should be quite certain it is a something in which they can be clothed. If this were not so, the Scripture which says it is *upon* them, would not be true. The righteousness which is imputed becomes so really and truly their own, that they are perfectly righteous in the sight of a holy God. That such is the case is placed beyond dispute by Matthew, who tells us, that "the *righteous*" shall go "into life eternal." They must, therefore, be truly righteous, as God could not call them righteous unless they were so in reality. He looks on things as they are, and He judges according to truth. The text at the commencement of this paragraph does not say that God imputes the consequences of righteousness, but He imputes the righteousness itself. As Dr. Owen has well observed, "In this imputation, the thing itself is first imputed unto us, and not any of the effects of it, but they are made ours by virtue of that imputation. . . . To say the righteousness of Christ is not imputed unto us, only its effects are so, is really to overturn all imputation. For the effects of the righteousness of Christ cannot be said properly to be imputed unto us; and if His righteousness itself be not so, imputation hath no place herein. . . . And,

therefore, the Socinians, who expressly oppose the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, and plead for a participation of its effects or benefits only, do wisely deny any such kind of righteousness of Christ, . . . as alone may be imputed unto us.”—(“Owen on Justification by Faith.”) My text, however, expressly asserts that “God imputeth righteousness” to man. There is a genuine righteousness, and a genuine imputation. Consequently the righteousness spoken of must be a righteousness which God can confer upon man. It cannot, as maintained by these Plymouths, be one of His own attributes, because men cannot be converted into Gods by having the attributes of divinity conferred upon them. This is impossible. If God were to give away His own attributes, He would cease to be God. It is so impossible for God to part with His attributes, that when we find Christ manifesting the attributes of divinity, we know of a truth He is really God. Here, again, we see that the views of the Darbyites undermine the divinity of Christ. If the attributes of God can be conferred upon man, *the possession of them by Christ would be no proof of the divinity of Christ.* The righteousness mentioned in the passage I have quoted is one which God is said to impute to man, and, therefore, it cannot be the attribute of divinity possessed by the Father and Son, but must be the righteousness which was worked out by Christ, or, in other words, Christ’s righteousness—

the righteousness which He has provided by the obedience of His life, and the atonement effected in His death, in the room and stead of His people.

In the 9th chapter of Daniel, we are told that a certain time was determined "to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness." Who is referred to here? Who is to make an end of sins, to finish transgression, to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness? Who but Christ could effect this? The righteousness, then, must be the righteousness of Christ. Moreover, it must be a righteousness which He could work out. It could not be one of the attributes of the Godhead, because Christ is to *bring it in*. He could not *bring in* His own attributes, which have existed from past eternity. This righteousness is to be brought in, and after being brought in, it is to be everlasting. It is to last for ever; but it does not say it has existed from past eternity. If such had been the case, the expression would have been similar to the one in the Psalms, which says, "From everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God." In the case of the righteousness, the word "everlasting" applies to its duration after being brought in, and, therefore, cannot refer to a pre-existing attribute; but in the other example, the expression, "From everlasting to everlasting," includes eternity past and future.

“Henceforth,” says Paul, “there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day.” If the righteousness be one of the attributes of the Godhead, as held by these Plymouths, how is it to be given to Paul? How is God to part with His own attribute, in order to place it on Paul’s head? Paul is not crowned with that righteousness which is an attribute of the Godhead, but he is crowned with the righteousness provided by Christ; and, as one portion of the Lamb’s bride, he is clothed with the robe of Christ’s righteousness, “the fine linen, clean and white; for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints.”

“For if by one man’s offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by One, Jesus Christ.” It surely will not be disputed by any one calling himself a Christian, that the one by whose offence death reigned is Adam, and that the One by whose righteousness life reigns is Christ. This is conveyed in the text as plainly as possible. Observe, it is not said that those who reign in life have a righteousness of their own. It is expressly stated that they *receive* the *gift* of righteousness. It was a *gift*, and capable of being *received* by man, and consequently could not possibly be one of the *attributes* of the Godhead, as that could not be bestowed upon man. If it was not one of the Divine attributes, it must have

been something worked out for man, and then bestowed upon him. By whom, then, was it worked out? Will any person venture to affirm it was worked out by the Father, and not by Jesus Christ? If it was not worked out by the Father, but by Christ, it must be the righteousness of Christ. There is no escape from this. The comparison between Adam and Christ is kept up in the next verse, "Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of One the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." As by the offence of one (Adam), condemnation came; even so by the righteousness of one (Christ), the free gift came unto justification. Now, if the righteousness mentioned here be not the righteousness of Christ, but of the Father, the comparison must lie between Adam and the Father. Can any person believe that Adam is here compared with the Father, and not with Christ? If he can, I will give him up. If Adam be not compared with the Father, but with Christ, then the righteousness spoken of must be the righteousness of Christ.

Further, "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners; so by the obedience of One shall many be made righteous." Surely the disobedience here which makes many sinners is the disobedience of Adam, and the obedience which makes many righteous is the obedience of Christ. Is it not, then, the righte-

ousness of Christ resulting from His obedience? Would any person venture to say it was the obedience of the Father which was compared or contrasted with the disobedience of Adam? Certainly not. The obedience here is the obedience of Christ. Now, what obedience did Christ render? And for whom did He render it? If we examine the Scriptures, we shall find that He rendered a perfect obedience to the precepts of the law in His life, and then submitted to the penalty of the broken law in His death on the cross. In whose stead did He stand throughout these transactions? Did He obey the law for Himself, or His people? Did He suffer the punishment for Himself, or His people? For His people, most certainly. He did not require to sojourn in this world on His own account; and if His obedient life had nothing to do with His saints, it was perfectly useless. He might as well have gone to the cross on the day of His birth, if He had nothing to do, as these Plymouths assert, by way of obedience to the law during life in the room of His Church. It is a glorious truth, however, that, as the substitute of His chosen ones, He rendered a perfect obedience to the holy law of God in His life, and paid the penalty of the broken law in His death, and thus *brought in an everlasting righteousness, the righteousness of Christ*—a righteousness which, being worked out by Christ, is capable of being conferred as a *gift* upon man.

But, finally, according to the marginal, proper, and literal rendering of the following passage, the righteousness is expressly called the righteousness of Christ : “Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained like precious faith with us through the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ.” Here it is expressly called the righteousness of Jesus Christ who is our God and Saviour. This verse places the question beyond dispute. It proves the righteousness to be the righteousness of Christ, and further shows that Christ is God. Just look at a similar expression on another subject—“Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave Himself for us.” Is it the Father who is mentioned here? Did the Father give Himself for us? Is it the Father, and not Jesus Christ, for whose appearing we are to look? Is it not plain that Jesus Christ, who gave Himself for us, is to appear (on the day of judgment), and that He is the great God and our Saviour? If so, a similar interpretation must make “the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ” the righteousness of Christ. Further, let us examine the expression, “Feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood.” Is it the Father is meant here? Had the Father flesh and blood? Did the Father purchase the Church? Was it not Christ who purchased the Church with

His own blood? And as Christ is both God and man, is not the Church which He purchased with His blood properly called the Church of God, or the Church of Christ? If so (and who can deny it?), a similar interpretation *must* make "the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ" the righteousness of Christ; and, Christ being God, it is properly and correctly also called the "righteousness of God." Those who dispute these principles of interpretation are bound, for their own consistency's sake, to deny that Christ is God. Socinianism would make the best foundation for the Darbyite opinions on this point.

Another great error of Plymouthism is, that Christ during His life did not actually suffer with or for His people, but that it was merely *sympathetic*. This is the fair result of the "heavenly humanity" view. If His humanity was "heavenly," and not ours, of course He could not actually suffer. The Plymouths are perfectly consistent with themselves in making the sufferings of Christ during His life merely sympathetic, because this is the only sort of suffering which could be borne by a person who, in place of *our* humanity, had a "heavenly humanity," was "a divine man," and, "in His manhood was the Lord from heaven." In his "guarded" edition of "Notes on Leviticus," pages 58 and 59, Mr. Mackintosh says, "'Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses.' *This was entirely sympathetic*—the power of

fellow-feeling which in Him was perfect. . . . There is, therefore, a very manifest difference between Christ's suffering as a voluntary sympathiser with human misery, and His suffering as the sinner's substitute." No doubt of it, Mr. Mackintosh; there is a vast difference between these two points—just as much difference as there is between your sympathetic theory and the sufferings of Christ as set forth in the Scriptures of Truth. The Holy Spirit informs us that Christ "took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses;" that He was "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief;" that He was "despised and rejected of men;" that He "hath borne our grief and carried our sorrows;" that when "He was reviled, He reviled not again; when He suffered, He threatened not;" and that He "suffered for us, leaving us an example, that" we "should follow His steps." The man who wishes to believe Scripture can have no difficulty here. Was Christ a man of sorrows on His own account or on ours? We are plainly told that He *took our* infirmities, *carried our* sorrows, *bore our* grief, and suffered *for us*, leaving an example which we are to follow. "For we have not an high priest," says the Scripture, "which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. . . . For in that He Himself hath suffered, being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted." Words

could not more explicitly assert that Christ suffered from the temptations endured in life, and that He was tempted on all points like as we are, yet without sin ; and the reason why all this took place is plainly stated. It was in order that He might be an example for His people, and that He might be "able to succour them that are tempted." Having Himself endured the griefs, sorrows, infirmities, and temptations to which His people are liable, He is in a proper position to be touched with the feeling of their infirmities. Besides, He endured all these things without sinning in any sense of the word, and, therefore, we are certain that He rendered a perfect obedience to the law of God. Such is the testimony of the Holy Spirit regarding the reality of the endurance of the griefs, sorrows, and infirmities which were exemplified in Christ's life : but Mr. Mackintosh is much better informed on the subject. He is able to tell us that there was no reality in the taking of our infirmities, and in the bearing of our sicknesses ; that it was nothing more than mere sympathy. To use his own words, "It was entirely sympathetic." He is far wiser than the Holy Ghost. Is it not dreadful to think of the position of the man who, with extreme professions of sanctity on his lips, will thus recklessly deal with the Word of God ? We are as expressly told that Christ, during life, took our infirmities, bare our sicknesses, and carried our sorrows, as we are

that He died for our sins on the cross. But as the first does not suit Mr. Mackintosh's theory, he has no hesitation in denying its reality, and making it "entirely sympathetic." On the same principle, he should deny the reality of Christ's death as an actual atonement, and make it "sympathetic" also. It is an awful thing to twist Scripture to the support of a system, and thus be guilty of "handling the Word of God deceitfully."

There is one point which Mr. Mackintosh and his disciples lay great stress on, as a proof that Christ had nothing whatever to do with or for His people till He came to the cross, and that is, that it was only on the cross He lost the light of His Father's countenance. "From time to time," says Mr. Mackintosh, "during the life of Christ, down here, heaven had opened to give forth the expression of divine complacency in Him; but on the cross God forsook Him, because He was making His soul an offering for sin. If Christ had been a sin-bearer all His life, then what was the difference between the cross and any other period? Why was He not forsaken of God during His' entire course? What was the difference between Christ on the cross, and Christ on the holy Mount of Transfiguration? Was He forsaken of God on the mount? These are very simple questions, which should be answered by those who maintain the idea of a life of sin-bearing."—"Notes on Leviticus," p. 56.) Great stress has been laid on this

argument. It is a regular stronghold. But I confess I am quite surprised at the shallowness of the mind which could either produce it, or rely upon it. Just look at it. Suppose Mr. Mackintosh's son was living a life of perfect obedience to all his commands, would he look upon him in the same light as if he were under punishment for the breach of every instruction he had given him? If he did, he would be a most inhuman monster. And yet this is exactly the position in which Mr. Mackintosh's argument would place the God of justice? It must also be remarked that Mr. M. misrepresents his opponents, after his own sly method, by slipping in the word "sin-bearing" for *obedience*. Christ, in His life, was rendering a complete and perfect *obedience* to the law, in the room and stead of His people; He was fulfilling every jot and tittle of its requirements: and, therefore, the Father, in place of hiding His countenance, was well pleased in Him. Would it not be worse than absurd to expect the Father to be displeased on account of a perfect and unsullied obedience to every requirement of His law? To be sure it would; and hence, during Christ's life of obedience, the Father was thoroughly pleased and satisfied. The case, however, was very different in regard to the cross. During His life He was obeying the law; but on the cross He was suffering the punishment for its breach. He was there suffering as a transgressor, having all the sins of His people

really upon Him. Consequently the Father could not but hide His face from Him, until the punishment was borne and the debt paid. This is the difference between Christ's life and the cross. In the one, He was rendering obedience, and the Father gave Him the light of His countenance ; in the other, He was under the curse of the law, and suffering the punishment for its breach, and consequently the Father hid His face from Him. An able correspondent of the *London Record* very properly observes : "The whole work of obedience of the Lord Jesus Christ is excluded from this new gospel. The surety might have gone at once from heaven to the cross on Calvary." If Christ had nothing to do with His people till He came to Calvary, for what purpose did He live ? Was His life practically useless ?

MACKINTOSH VALOUR.

I LOOKED in vain over the pages of the *Coleraine Chronicle* for Mr. Mackintosh's reply to the second letter I published in that paper. I could not in truth say I really expected a reply to that letter. He had got so thoroughly entangled in a labyrinth, without a thread to guide him, that escape was hopeless. No man on earth could have relieved him from the predicament in which he had involved himself. The

•

attempt he made to improve his position, only made him flounder the deeper.

I did not, I could not, believe Mr. Mackintosh was such a monster as to continue circulating an awful heresy which, either in a palpable or in a "guarded" form, underlies almost every article he has written, *if he did not believe in the doctrines he was propounding*. Consequently, I never for one moment imagined he had changed the opinions he originally published. To give him a full opportunity, however, of making the matter plain to the world, I put a number of questions, which, if answered, would have left no doubt on the subject. But these questions he has not found it convenient to reply to. The public will have no difficulty in knowing the reason why. He engaged in this controversy with great ardour at first; he looked like a valiant soldier in the first flush of excitement; but the moment he saw the batteries before him were fully manned and thoroughly equipped, he came to the wise, although unmanly, conclusion, that "discretion was the better part of valour." The flying Americans levelled a coward's gun at Dr. Russell; Mr. Mackintosh has presented one at me. He sent a *private-public* letter to the editor of the *Chronicle*, which might be *shown* to all and sundries, but which was not to be *printed*. I saw it, and I only wish I had got a stretch at it. His conduct was cowardly in the extreme, and betrayed a want of confidence in his principles.

As I had not the slightest idea of allowing Mr. Mackintosh to escape, I demanded an explicit answer, yes or no, without any shuffling, evasion, explanation, or "guarding," to the following questions :—Does he now *deny* that Christ, "as to His manhood, was the Lord from heaven"? Does he now *deny* that Christ was "a divine man"? Does he now *deny* that Christ had a "heavenly humanity"? Does he now *believe* that Christ appeared in *our* humanity? Does he now *believe* that Christ was *made under the law*? Will he positively declare that his opinions regarding the *humanity* of Christ are exactly and precisely the same as those which are held by the Established Church, the Presbyterians, the Methodists, the Baptists, the Independents, and the Covenanters? These were fair, plain, intelligible questions, and required only yes or no for an answer. Indeed, this is the only sort of answer I would have taken, as I would suffer no quibbling in the matter; no special pleading; no "guarding." Some of Mr. Mackintosh's followers have written to me to excuse his silence, on the ground that he might not think the *Chronicle* a proper place for religious subjects; but this excuse cannot hold; because he thought it a very suitable place until he saw he was conquered. It was only when he was obliged to beat an ignominious retreat, that it became necessary to avoid the columns of a newspaper. In the hope of a Plymouth victory, the paper was com-

pletely sanctified ; but the moment a crushing defeat became inevitable, the *Chronicle* was unholy ground. This is quite in harmony with the deeply jesuitical system of Plymouthism.

THE PASTORAL OFFICE.

THE existence of the Pastoral Office is so plainly taught in Scripture, that I am surprised any person would think of questioning it. "I will give you pastors according to mine heart," says the Lord, by Jeremiah, "which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding." God has here promised pastors : is He a man that He should not fulfil? The duty of these pastors is also specially mentioned. They are to feed the flock with knowledge and understanding. If so, they must possess a high degree of knowledge and understanding themselves, because they could not communicate if they had not received. It must also be observed, that the parties who feed must be different from those who are to be fed ; there must be both a pastor and a flock. Hence it is evident all the flock cannot be teachers. If all the flock are to be placed on a par in this respect, the distinction of pastor and flock is lost ; and the establishment would correspond with Donald Carr's description of the school in which "the one was taughting the other."

“Then the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea : which also they did, and sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul.” We here see that the assistance for the relief of the brethren was not sent to them direct, but through the hands of the *elders*; and this shows that there were elders, and that they occupied a prominent position in comparison with the ordinary members. A careful examination of Scripture will demonstrate that the term Elder is applied exactly to the same office as pastor and bishop (see Titus i. 5-7, where elder and bishop are used interchangeably) ; and hence this passage proves that there must have been pastors distinct from the flock, over which they were placed, and for whom they received the contributions which were sent by Barnabas and Saul.

“And when they had ordained them elders in every church.” It is evident from this that a church must exist before an elder or pastor can be placed over it. It is also plain that a pastor was placed over *every* church so formed. There was no exception—“every church.” It is further manifest that the pastor was not to run, after Plymouth fashion, through all the churches in the kingdom. It does not say the elders were to run from place to place, but they were ordained *in* every church. If a church cannot, by the greatest effort, support a pastor, or if it be impossible

to find one of the proper description, God will not lay the want of one to the charge of that church, because He is not such a hard taskmaster as to require people to do impossibilities in this affair ; but I am perfectly certain if a church, from *any* other cause than an *utter impossibility*, neglect to procure a pastor, it is committing a great sin in the face of high Heaven, and cannot possibly prosper. I have never known prosperity to take place where the Pastoral Office was despised, and *God's arrangements* thus neglected and trampled under foot. The Plymouths are not the only guilty parties in this matter. It is quite a common thing to find men who *pretend* to be guided by Bible principles and scriptural authority, and yet feel that it is no sin to neglect the plain teaching of Scripture regarding the necessity of procuring pastors for the churches. They are great sticklers for the exercise of gifts, as they call it ; and so long as it comes under that denomination, they will be quite content to listen to the most monotonous, silly, trashy, and commonplace discourses that ever fell from ignorant and illiterate lips. Whilst there is a total absence of all real gift and power, they get infatuated with the sound of their own voices, and become so far puffed up with pride and self-conceit, that they cannot bear to submit to the Scripture rule of having one who is "apt to teach" placed over every church. They thus, under the pretence of standing by Scrip-

ture, trample under foot the very office which was instituted by God for the instruction, edification, and growth of a church of Christ. As might be expected where God's institutions are despised, these parties become dead, stunted, and formal. In place of recommending the system of Christ by their conduct, they become a direct stumbling-block to all who witness their order. If in any case a pastor is to be chosen, these men of "gifts" are great judges and hard to please. The pastor must submit to every imaginable test before they can sanction his appointment; but if it be proposed, as I have done, to submit their own gifts and qualifications to the decision of a church, the scene is entirely changed. The pastor must be tested; but the men of "gifts" are so superhuman that they cannot submit to any test outside their own infallible judgment. With the cry of liberty in their mouths, they deprive the churches of all liberty, and become veritable popes. The only liberty they grant is the liberty of listening to their own "sweet voices," whether the auditors wish to hear them or not. In fact, no greater specimens of petty tyrants can be found."

In New Testament times, I believe that every church had a plurality of elders; hence it is very important that the same principle should be carried out still. In this way, the variety of gifts in different men will be found of immense use in a church. In-

deed, I go the whole length of admitting that the Scripture compels us to have a plurality of pastors in every instance where it can be obtained in accordance with scriptural rule and qualification ; but I totally deny that in cases where it is impossible to have two, in accordance with scriptural rule and qualification, we are compelled to refuse one, on the ground that we must not have one when we cannot find or support two. Such a principle would be inconsistent with the arrangements of both God and man. On this plan we could not perform any of our duties, unless we perform them all,—we dare not attend to one ordinance without attending to more ; we could not do a single thing in a church, unless that church was perfect and complete in every arrangement, even the simplest. God calls upon us to have everything in a church as perfect as we can ; but He does not require us to do what is impossible ; He does not forbid us to do one duty because we cannot do two. It is just as absurd to argue that we must not have one pastor because we cannot get two, as it would be to maintain that the man who cannot find three meals in the day, must starve with hunger rather than eat one which he can get. Our proper course is to do everything right as far as we go, and to go as far as we can ; but we are not justified in sitting still and saying we will do nothing because we cannot do everything. In point of fact it will be found, on careful examination, that

those who object to one pastor because two cannot be obtained, are influenced in their conduct by a thorough hatred to the pastoral office as delineated in Scripture.

“And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the church and of the apostles and the elders.” Could anything be plainer than this? We have three classes here—the church, the apostles, and the elders. Now, if the elders or pastors were essential to the wellbeing of the churches at the very time the apostles were on earth, is there any reason for supposing that they could be dispensed with at present? What reasons could be adduced for their necessity in those days, which do not still exist? The churches in those days had the inspired apostles to apply to, and we, in these days, have the Sacred Scriptures to appeal to; but still, the elders or pastors are just as necessary now to feed the flock with knowledge and understanding as they were in apostolic times. Seeing we have the Scriptures, we can dispense with the miraculous gifts possessed by apostles and prophets; but there is just the same necessity as ever for the exercise of the gifts of the pastors or teachers.

“And He (Christ) gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers.” If the pastors and teachers were necessary at the time the apostles and prophets

existed, they are surely equally necessary now. It is very evident all these classes were necessary at the time they were first given : otherwise they would not have existed at all. If they were all necessary then, they are all necessary now, *unless* we have some substitute to put in their place. Where, then, is the substitute? We have a perfect substitute now, in the possession of the Holy Scriptures, for the apostles and prophets; but where is the substitute for the pastors and teachers? The first churches had the inspired apostles and prophets, we have the inspired writings : so far we are on a par. But if, notwithstanding the miraculous gifts, they required pastors or elders in every church in those days, surely there must be an equal necessity for them now. Further, for what purpose were these classes originally given? "For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." Such were the duties to be performed. Will any person venture to say those duties ceased at a particular time? So long as the duties last, there must be ample means for their performance. So long as there are saints upon earth, so long as there is any portion of the body of Christ (His Church) in this world, the work of the ministry must go on, the saints must be perfected, and the body of Christ (His Church) must be edified. In primitive times they had pastors and teachers as well as inspired men; in

these days we require pastors and teachers, as well as the words of inspiration. But my text goes further still, for it says these were given, not for a day or an hour, but "till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." This can never end while the world lasts. It will end only when the last Christian is removed to heaven. Consequently pastors and teachers must still exist. We have no substitute for them in the same way as we have the sacred oracles to take the place of those who were endowed with miraculous gifts.

"Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." Again are the Scriptures perfectly explicit. The saints of Christ, or the Church of Christ, at Philippi, had bishops and deacons. Do we not require bishops and deacons as much as they did? Are we to be behind them in Christian privileges? Are we able to dispense with bishops and deacons, seeing that they were required even under the eyes of the apostles?

"Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the Word of God. . . . The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, . . . feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the

oversight thereof ; . . . and when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." The saints are here desired to remember those who have the rule over them, and who have spoken the Word of God. There must, therefore, be rulers and ruled, teachers and taught. They are not left as a random medley. The apostle, who is an elder as well as an apostle, exhorts the elders not only to feed the flock of God, but also to take the oversight thereof, and if they perform their duty as they ought, they will be rewarded by the Chief Shepherd when He comes at the last great day. It is evident here that the duty of the elders is to feed the flock as well as to rule over it. Consequently, so long as there is a flock to be fed and ruled, elders or pastors must exist. It must also be observed that a *Chief Shepherd* is mentioned ; from which it is palpable that there must be *under-shepherds*. When the under-shepherds cease to exist in the churches on earth, there can be no Chief Shepherd for them, because in the very nature of things there can be no chief without an under.

" If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work." A bishop, then, is not a common man. He has a special office, and an official position. He is more than a common soldier. Amongst the various qualifications enumerated for a bishop, the capability of teaching and ruling occupies a prominent position,

“A bishop then must be . . . apt to teach, . . . one that ruleth well his own house ; . . . for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God ?” Who will read this and dare to say that a church requires neither ruling nor teaching, but is just to be left to the mercy of any booby who may imagine that the inflations of his own pride and vanity are the movings of the Holy Spirit ? That the Plymouths are in a miserable plight in this point of view is rendered evident by the lamentation made by Mr. Mackintosh over the condition of their gatherings. “Alas ! alas,” says he, “we often see men on their feet, in the midst of our assemblies (that word *our* will creep in), whom common-sense, to say nothing of spirituality, would keep in their seats. We have often sat and gazed in astonishment at some whom we have heard attempting to minister in the assembly. We have often thought that the assembly has been looked upon by a certain class of ignorant men, fond of hearing themselves talk, as a sphere in which they might easily figure without the pains of school and college work. . . . If an assembly be troubled by the intrusion of ignorant and foolish men,—men who have never yet measured themselves in the presence of God,—men who boldly overleap the wide domain over which common-sense, good taste, and moral propriety preside, and then vainly talk of being led by the Holy Ghost,—restless men who *will* be at something, and

who keep the assembly in a continual state of nervous apprehension, not knowing what's to come next," &c. (Quoted in *Dennett's Lecture*.) Well done, Mr. Mackintosh! You have made out a thorough case against your own sect. There is no doubt that all you have said is perfectly true: but it is the inevitable result of your own system. In place of blasphemously saying that the Holy Spirit is presiding under such circumstances, you should set all down to the right cause—a rotten system. For what purpose are the qualifications of the bishops or elders so minutely laid down in Scripture, if they are not to serve for guiding us? Have we no special interest in these matters now? If the first churches required men who were highly qualified for ruling and teaching, do we not need the same? Unless it can be shown that we are all inspired, we surely have as much need of rulers and teachers as they had. The circumstances which rendered pastors and teachers necessary at first were not of a temporary nature, nor did they belong specially to any country or age, and hence, so long as they continue—so long as there are churches to be ruled and taught—there must be rulers and teachers. The teachers and rulers can cease only when the necessity for teaching and ruling ceases.

“Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine. For the Scripture saith, Thou shalt not

muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn ; and, the labourer is worthy of his reward." There are several items of importance in this passage. The duty of the elders is to rule, as well as to labour in word and doctrine. They must attend to discipline ; at the same time they are to be very careful to instruct the flock in all the doctrines contained in the Word of God. They must be both " apt to teach " and capable of ruling. When they have done this, they are to be rewarded. They are all worthy of reward, but some of them more than others. Some are to be doubly rewarded. The Scripture here lays down the rule of fair play, which is applicable in all the pursuits of life—every man is to be rewarded according to the ability he displays, and the work he performs. The context here shows that double honour means double support. The temporal wants of the elder are to be supplied, so that he may be enabled to attend to his duties. He is to live on the proceeds of his ministerial labours, just in the same way as the ox must be permitted to support nature by the proceeds of his labour, whilst he treadeth out the corn for the wants of others. This is the plain meaning of the comparative illustration. If the ordinary " labourer is worthy of his hire," surely the spiritual labourer is not less so. Observe, too, it is not a mere gratuity ; it is *hire*, or wages, or a debt honestly due. This is the teaching of Scripture, and I believe the man who denies it, generally does so

because he is too great a miser to dip his hand into his own pocket. I am sorry to say the greatest disgrace which hangs over all sects of Christians in this land, is the miserable—shamefully miserable—way in which they support their ministers. If they were properly alive to their duty, and their solemn responsibilities to God, they would, in general, pay ten times as much as they do. I am surprised they are not often ashamed to see their ministers in straits and difficulties in worldly matters. They should never act so as to compel their pastors to follow worldly occupations or starve. There is a prevalent idea abroad that ministers ought to sacrifice something for the sake of the gospel. So they ought. But I ask, Are they the only parties in the community who are to sacrifice, or rather to be sacrificed? Is the man who, from his education and natural ability, could earn three hundred a year in any other profession, to be content with one hundred a year, doled out from heartless payers, merely because he is a preacher of the gospel? Is he to sacrifice two hundred a year, whilst rich men in his congregation would not sacrifice two pounds? Do the Scriptures demand this? *Never*. The labourer is to be rewarded according to his work. Can any man call himself a Christian, whilst he neglects his duty to a minister who is faithfully labouring in word and doctrine? Shame! oh, shame! How can people expect a blessing to rest upon the cause they are

engaged in, while their miserable parsimony prevents them from *seeing* and *doing* their duty as laid down in the Scriptures of Truth? Are these narrow-hearted creatures aware that it is written, "The Lord ordaineth that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel. . . . Let him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things. Be not deceived: God is not mocked. . . . He which soweth sparingly shall also reap sparingly: and he which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully?" It is to be hoped that they have never seen these passages; but if they do cast their eyes on them, and afterwards decry ministers for taking and seeking a proper support for preaching the gospel, let them answer to the Almighty, who will not be mocked.

"But, ah! dear friends," says Mrs. Spurgeon in an admirable letter which she published in *The Sword and Trowel* for August 1876, "when I look at this list I see the only shadow of sadness that ever rests upon my Book Fund. It is the grief of knowing that there exists a terrible necessity for this service of love; that, without this help, the poor pastors to whom it has been sent must have gone on famishing for lack of mental food, their incomes being so wretchedly small that they scarcely knew how to 'provide things honest' for themselves and their families, while money for the purchase of books is

absolutely unattainable. . . . Their very gratitude for the boon conferred, often makes my heart ache in the midst of its gladness, for the sense of need must have been sorely felt, since relief is received with such rapture. . . . Surely these servants of Christ ought to have received better treatment at our hands, than to have been left pining so long without the aids which are vitally necessary to them in their sacred calling. Books are as truly a minister's needful tools as the plane, and the hammer, and the saw, are the necessary adjuncts of a carpenter's bench. We pity a poor mechanic whom accident has deprived of his working gear, we straightway get up a subscription to restore it, and certainly never expect a stroke of work from him while it is lacking : why, I wonder, do we not bring the same common-sense help to our poor ministers, and furnish them liberally with the means of procuring the essentially-important books ? Is it not pitiful to think of their struggling on from year to year on their miserably small incomes ? Many have large families, many more sick wives, some, alas ! have both : they have their children's education to provide for, are obliged to keep up a respectable appearance or their hearers would be scandalised, and how they manage to do all this and yet keep out of debt, only they and their ever-faithful God can know. Are these men to be kept in poverty so deep that they positively cannot afford the price of a new

book without letting their little ones go barefoot? The 'labourer is worthy of his hire;' but these poor labourers in the gospel-field get a pittance which is unworthy both of the workman and the work." For the remainder of Mrs. Spurgeon's excellent letter, I must refer my readers to *The Sword and Trowel*.

I shall here make a digression from the direct line of my subject for the purpose of remarking on the duty of *Teaching*. In order that the pastor may feed the flock, he must possess tact, judgment, and good natural ability. As Mr. Spurgeon has well said, "A really valuable minister would have excelled at anything. There is scarcely anything impossible to a man who can keep a congregation together for years, and be the means of edifying them for hundreds of consecutive Sabbaths: he must be possessed of some abilities, and be by no means a fool or ne'er-do-well. Jesus Christ deserves the best men to preach His cross and not the empty-headed and the shiftless." Without good natural capacity it is impossible for any man to do full justice to a congregation. He must be "apt to teach." This is a scriptural qualification which cannot possibly be dispensed with. How few do we find coming up to the mark on this point! They may be "apt to sermonise," which is very good in its own place, but they seldom think of teaching. What is the cause of this? It is chiefly, perhaps, owing to the fact that sermonising requires less talent,

less knowledge, and less study than exposition. "With little acquaintance with the Scriptures as a whole," says my father, "and with a little general knowledge, a man may patch up an ordinary sermon. The difficulties consist in the method being technical ; to observe which, it is necessary to learn the art in this as in all other trades. Such a sermon gives scope rather to a trial of invention than a knowledge of God's Word. When a man has got a knack of dividing and enumerating particulars, and becomes sufficiently acquainted with the drama of the pulpit, he may readily make a sermon upon any popular text. When he has got his heads and particulars, it will be an easy thing to pour some pious rhapsody on each of them. In this consists much of what is called evangelical preaching. Teaching, however, requires more erudition, more extensive knowledge of the Scriptures, more advancement in the divine life, and a more solid judgment." "Once start a sermon with a great idea," remarks that prince of preachers, Mr. Spurgeon, "and from that moment the discourse forms itself without much labour to the preacher ; but as for the exposition, you must keep to the text, you must face the difficult points, and must search into the mind of the Spirit rather than your own. You will soon reveal your ignorance as an expositor if you do not study ; therefore diligent reading will be forced upon you."

There are two methods of teaching which may be

had recourse to. The one is to take up a special subject, and trace it fairly, regularly, and fully through Scripture, something after the method which I have attempted, but too briefly, in the chapters on the Righteousness of Christ, and the Pastoral Office. This plan will serve an admirable purpose occasionally ; but it can never entirely supersede the second method—that of the regular, consecutive exposition of Scripture in the order in which God has thought proper to give it to us. When this plan is adopted, every subject is treated in the right proportion ; none is omitted through mere human wisdom ; and none receives undue importance. Everything is right, because it is in accordance with God's own order. Moreover, unpalatable truths are much better received in this way than in any other, because the doctrines, in place of being forced on the attention, arise naturally and simply out of the texts ; and there are few men sufficiently hardened to rebel against a plain and inevitable deduction from a passage lying straight before their eyes, and one which has not been brought up to view with any special intention. As there is never too much on one subject at a time, the point does not become irksome to the hearer.

Although it is impossible for any real advance to be made in divine things without the operation of the Holy Spirit, it may yet safely be affirmed that, as far as mere human instrumentality is concerned,

there is no difference whatever between teaching the Scriptures and teaching any other subject. This is an important point, which seems to have been lost sight of. If it had not, sermonising could never have superseded exposition in the way it has done. If the principal of a school, the occupant of a professor's chair in a university, or the lawyer at the bar, were to proceed with his subject after the sermonising method, he would be turned out of office or left without practice in a week. The professor would hardly get through a course of science in a quarter of a century. Would any sane man ever think of teaching natural philosophy, by giving an eloquent oration of an hour's length on a sentence here and a sentence there, in place of dealing with the subject in a regular and systematic manner? Certainly not. If the contents of any book are to be learned in a school or a college, they will be taken regularly inch by inch from beginning to end, simply because this is the only rational method. Why, then, is a different plan to be adopted with the Scriptures? Why do theologians ignore the rational method? God has given us the whole Bible, and it is our duty to become acquainted with every part of it, if within our power. A regular consecutive exposition will answer this purpose as far as human agency can accomplish it. But no congregation can ever become wise in divine things by merely listening to sermons with a text for their

motto. The knowledge of the hearers will be superficial and trifling in the extreme. To prove this, it is only necessary to go into a congregation so circumstanced, and then examine the hearers on a single chapter in the Scriptures. They will be found marvellously innocent on the subject. In point of fact, they are so conscious of their ignorance, that they would run away almost as readily as they would for the reading of the Riot Act. They could not explain a single verse, for the simple reason that they have never had the verses explained to them.

A good expositor will take all the meaning out of a verse, and then at once proceed to the next. He must not only be careful to take all the food out of the verse which it is intended to communicate, but he must also specially guard against adding to the Scripture, by putting things into the text which it never contained. This last, although a common practice, is a great crime, because it is adding to the Scripture, and a being wiser than the Holy Spirit. It is no excuse to say, as is often done, the doctrines inculcated are true, and are to be found elsewhere. When God has not put them into the text under consideration, man should not attempt it. For this reason it is nearly impossible to make a popular sermon without turning the Bible into a novel. The discourse has as little as possible to do with the substance of the text, which scarcely serves the purpose of a motto. The

imagination may roam at large, and men's ears may be tickled, but a thorough knowledge of Scripture can never be obtained by sermonising. As Mr. Spurgeon has well remarked, "If only that part which we preach upon be expounded to them, how little of the Bible can they ever know! If you will mark your Bibles with lines under the texts from which you have spoken, as I have always done with an old copy which I keep in my study, you will discover that, in twelve or fourteen years, very little of the book has been gone through; a very large portion of it remains unmarked, like an unploughed field. Try, then, by exposition, to give your people a fair view of the entire compass of revelation; take them, as it were, to the top of Nebo, and show them the whole land from Dan to Beersheba, and prove to them that everywhere it floweth with milk and honey." I was greatly struck, when a child, by an observation on sermonising, made by my father from the pulpit. He said, if any of his hearers, who had a son or a daughter in America, were to receive a letter from their child, they would take it to some person who could read writing, if they could not do it themselves. It would never content them, however, to have a sentence read here and another there, whilst the remainder was all passed over. They would not be satisfied to omit even as much as the address at the top or bottom of the letter. They must have every word of the letter.

Why, then, is the same course not to be adopted regarding the Bible? It is the letter which God has sent from heaven to earth, and should be expounded every word.

In his excellent article on expounding, Mr. Spurgeon cautions his pupils against pedantry in the pulpit. "Those gentlemen," says he, "who know the least Greek, are the most sure to air their rags of learning in the pulpit; they miss no chance of saying, 'The Greek is so-and-so.' It makes a man an inch and a half taller by a *foolometer*, if he everlastingly lets fall bits of Greek and Hebrew, and even tells the people the tense of the verb and the case of the noun, as I have known some do. Those who have no learning usually make a point of displaying the pegs on which learning ought to hang." These observations should be a warning to those smatterers in learning who are continually altering the text of revelation. They are not intended, however, to prevent the proper use of learning in exposing the few mistakes which are to be found in the English version of the Scriptures. Indeed, it is a marvel that the mistakes in our version are so few as they are; and I have no sympathy whatever with the effort which is being made at present to give us a new translation, because I feel certain that where one real mistake will be rectified, a dozen passages will be put wrong. In place of being a correct translation, I believe it will be found to be one to foster some pet

opinions. Time will tell. The errors in our present version are not numerous ; but they are sometimes very important, and should be made known. I once heard an Arminian descanting with great energy on the ninth verse of the second chapter of Hebrews, which says that Christ tasted "death for every man." He laid great emphasis on the expression, "every man," and was thus carrying all before him ; but he was sadly put about by a few observations which I felt constrained to make. I told him, if he were really quoting Scripture, his argument would have great force ; but if he professed to understand the text in the Greek, I had no hesitation in charging him with the high crime of fabricating Scripture for the purpose of deceiving those who were listening to him. This came on him like an electrifying shock, and I took good care that he never recovered from its effects, as I placed a Greek Testament in his hand, and asked him to point out, in the original, the word which corresponded with "man," in the translation. This was a regular stopper for him, as there is not so much even as one letter in the original for the word "man" in the translation. There is no sort of shadow, or shade of cover, or excuse for it. Our translators should never have put in the word "man." They should have left the passage exactly where the Holy Spirit left it in the original—"Should taste death for every." The parties included in the term "every" would then

have been easily ascertained, because the next verse demonstrates that it was every *son brought to glory*. We thus see that, when properly translated, the passage, in place of supporting the Arminian heresy of extending the death of Christ to those who were actually in hell at the time He suffered, goes directly on the other side, and demonstrates by its context that Christ tasted death for every "son" brought to glory ; for those who are "sanctified ;" for those He is not ashamed to call "brethren ;" for the "children" which God hath given Him.

The exposition should be reasoned out fairly and simply, without in the least overstraining the text, or bringing up far-fetched and imaginary ideas. The imagination should never be let loose on such momentous subjects. If men want a novel, let them go to Sir Walter Scott, rather than the Word of God. If an interpretation be correct, it will commend itself to the understanding. It will appear plain, simple, and natural. It may sometimes be difficult to ascertain the exact meaning of an obscure passage ; but one thing is absolutely certain, that no exposition of the obscure text can ever be correct which contradicts the plain, palpable, and inevitable meaning of other portions of divine truth. The Word of God can never contradict itself. If properly understood, the obscure passages would be capable of an exposition in perfect harmony with the plain. If any doctrine is to be

established, it must be proved by texts whose meaning is plain and inevitable. Passages of doubtful signification can never be properly alleged in support of any doctrine. Unless they are of certain meaning they can prove nothing. I have sometimes heard men hammering away like battering-rams in the silly attempt to establish their idea of the meaning of an obscure passage by alleging, in the way of illustration and proof, other passages whose meaning was quite as obscure as that of the text they were attempting to elucidate. This is just going on the principle of making one infallible out of two fallibles—one plain out of two that are dark. The true principle of Biblical interpretation is to prove a subject by texts which are plain ; and when we come to those passages which are obscure, in place of alleging them to prove a thing which they can never fairly do, we should rest perfectly satisfied if we can give them a fair, consistent, and rational interpretation, which will harmonise with plain portions of divine truth. Let us prove by the inevitable ; let us rest contented if we can just fairly and rationally, without straining, succeed in explaining the obscure.

Some men act on the principle as if they thought it no sin to gather up a certain number of texts, apparently on one side, for the purpose of overbalancing some other texts which they imagine to be on the other side. In this way they make the passages con-

tradict each other, and then take the side which pleases their own taste best. They mistake apparent contradictions for real contradictions, and then hold their own pet doctrines. In place of looking for the harmony which must of necessity exist in the Word of the God of truth, they make the Bible worse than a fable. How they can do so, and yet believe it to be of divine origin, is a mystery to me. The man who sets one portion of revelation to contradict another is worse than an infidel. He makes God a liar. He should burn his Bible, and profess himself to be what he really is—an atheist. Even good men have been known to say, that they preach Calvinism when they come on a Calvinistic text, and Arminianism when they come on an Arminian text. Such a statement is nothing short of impious. It degrades the Bible even below the production of an honest man. On this view it could not be the Word of God. Calvinism and Arminianism are as diametrically opposed to each other as any two things could possibly be ; consequently they cannot both be true. It would not even make them both true if they were in the Bible, for the simple reason that they contradict each other, and a contradiction can never be true. Some one of them must be false. As I have already demonstrated, in my work on "Transubstantiation," the existence of a contradiction in the Bible, in place of proving the contradiction to be true, would only prove the book which con-

tained it to be false. Hence I say that the man who holds two such contradictory things as Calvinism and Arminianism to be in the Bible, is just guilty of the most awful impiety. He charges God with contradicting Himself. Calvinism and Arminianism are not both in the Book. Such a thing is impossible, because they directly contradict each other.

The sun of creation is not more visible in the heavens at noonday than is Calvinism in the writings of Paul ; consequently the harmony of divine truth must for ever exclude the doctrines of Arminius from the pages of revelation. Indeed it is a marvellous problem in human nature, how any rational man could believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures and yet deny the doctrine of election. For consistency's sake he is bound to cut all such passages as the following out of the Book : "For the elect's sake those days shall be shortened. . . . Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect ? . . . For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth. . . . According as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world. . . . Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children. . . . Being predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will. . . . As the elect of God. . . . Knowing, brethren

beloved, your election of God. . . . God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth. . . . According to the faith of God's elect. . . . Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father. . . . But ye are a chosen generation. . . . Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began. . . . For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son. . . . Moreover, whom He did predestinate, them He also called ; and whom He called, them He also justified ; and whom He justified, them He also glorified." The meaning of these passages is so plain and inevitable that it is utterly impossible for any rational man to mistake it. Consequently, the man who holds any doctrine at direct variance with these texts, compels revelation to contradict itself, and reduces Scripture from the dignified position of being the Word of God. His position is a most awful one. Indeed, leaving Scripture out of the question, every rational man is bound to believe in predestination, who believes in a God possessing the divine attribute of foreknowledge. If God did not know everything that would happen before it happened, He would not be God at all. If He had to wait till the event happened before He could know anything about it, He

would be no better than a man. It is necessary to the perfection of God's nature to grant that He had the divine attribute of foreknowledge. If so, He must have known from all eternity those who would be saved and those who would be damned. Consequently, if He knew this from all eternity, to use an able argument from one of the Largs tracts, it must have been *fixed* from all eternity. Unless it was fixed, He could not have known it. If it were uncertain, He might guess at it, but no more. Guessing, however, is so inconsistent with Divinity, that the man who maintains such a view cannot believe in God at all. His God would be no better than the gods of the heathen. His knowledge would be imperfect. There can be no uncertainty in God's knowledge. He knew everything precisely from the beginning. If He knew all who would be saved, it is self-evident that it must have been fixed from all eternity who would be saved. If it was not fixed, He could not really have known anything correctly about it. If there was any uncertainty, His knowledge would have been equally uncertain. He could not have known whether there would have been only one, or a million. What idea does this give us of God? Would He have been any better than a man if He had been obliged to wait till the day of judgment to know the saved? Did He prepare the "mansions" without knowing they would all be occupied? He knew from all eternity who would be saved; otherwise He was no

God. If He knew it, it must have been fixed. Who, then, fixed it? God, and God only. We thus come to the inevitable conclusion, that all who believe in the attributes of the Godhead must believe in the doctrine of predestination—a doctrine which is founded in reason and developed most extensively throughout revelation.

The doctrine of predestination does not, as its enemies allege, overturn the responsibility of man. Nothing could be more certain than that the Scripture plainly teaches that man, since the Fall, is necessarily and inevitably prone to evil, whilst, at the same time, he is held accountable to God for all his actions. The man must deny the use of his senses who cannot see these two things in revelation. If we are called on to explain or reconcile them, we must at once confess our inability to do so. It is a point which is far beyond the compass of our reason, and God has not thought fit to explain it in revelation. We must, therefore, leave it as we find it. As it is not within the province of reason, and as it has not been revealed, we must not attempt to fathom it. We are no more able to comprehend it than we are able to fathom time, eternity, space, life, death, and Deity. Although we cannot comprehend them, we are bound to believe the two doctrines referred to, because they are plainly set forth in various places in the infallible words of inspiration. How any man has been able to deny their existence in Scripture is a marvel to me. His

opposition to the doctrines cannot possibly be based on the want of evidence, but must be owing to an utter want of disposition to submit to the evidence which is so plainly before him. The denial of these doctrines is just a species of infidelity.

Although this is not the place for discussing these questions, I shall, before quitting the subject, refer to one point, which I imagine the most reckless amongst the professors of Christianity will not venture to dispute—namely, That man may sin, and be held accountable for his sin, in carrying out the very decrees of the Almighty. This is a wonderful idea; but it is an incontrovertible truth. Christ came into the world for the very purpose of dying on Calvary's cross for the sins of His people. Every single thing that happened was absolutely necessary for the fulfilment of that marvellous fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. All was prophesied and decreed beforehand. It must happen, and happen in an exact and particular manner. It was unavoidable, because it belonged to the eternal purposes of the Almighty. But yet, notwithstanding all this, the parties who carried God's decrees into operation were held accountable as sinners for their actions. The action was inevitable, and yet it was sinful. Here we have the two doctrines palpably and plainly taught. No man dare venture to deny the fact. We cannot explain it, but we must admit it. The facts are patent throughout revelation, and the words of Scripture are

unmistakable : "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain. . . . But those things, which God before had showed by the mouth of all His prophets, that Christ should suffer, He hath so fulfilled. Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out. . . . All things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me. . . . Truly the Son of Man goeth as it was determined ; but woe unto that man by whom He is betrayed. It had been good for that man if he had not been born." No language could be more decisive than this. Christ was delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God ; His sufferings were foretold by all the prophets ; and yet the parties who fulfilled the predictions, and carried out the determinate counsels, were held responsible as having done it by wicked hands. Here the two doctrines are as plainly set forth as words can depict them. The crucifixion was inevitable from all eternity, and yet the performance of it was sin. Christ must needs be betrayed, and yet it would have been well for Judas had he never been born. We may look upon this as a marvellous and inexplicable doctrine ; but that is no reason why we should vainly and foolishly attempt to deny its existence in Scripture. Deny it as we may, it is there. To some it is very unpalatable ;

but that does not make it untrue. Neither is there any valid reason why we should reject revelation because it contains such doctrines. On the contrary, if the Book were of man, it would have been differently written, and the plan on which it is written, being objectionable to the natural mind of man, is a strong argument for its divine origin. We can neither fathom nor reconcile man's necessity and responsibility. They are not within the compass of reason. It is perfectly possible that the one may be true in one sense, and the other in a different sense, and, therefore, there is no necessary contradiction between them. When they do not necessarily contradict each other, they have a just right to be believed on proper evidence. These doctrines just occupy the same position in regard to the exercise of reason that the Trinity does. They are far above its reach, and, therefore, we cannot comprehend or explain them. Under these circumstances, and seeing they are plainly set forth in Scripture, we are bound to believe them. This course is consistent alike with revelation, reason, and good common-sense. Since they are not contrary to reason, it would be anything but rational to reject them as untrue, whilst we firmly believe in many other things, such as life, death, eternity, time, space, and Deity, which are quite as incomprehensible as necessity and responsibility. If we were to believe nothing but what we are able to comprehend, we would believe very little. Every man believes he has life ;

but I would like to see the man who can tell me what life is. We may know its consequences, and the indications of its existence, but we cannot in the least degree fathom its nature. It is a great mistake to imagine, as some have done, that the doctrines I have been referring to are in the same position as the doctrine of Transubstantiation. They are above reason, it is within the bounds of reason; they do not necessarily contain a contradiction, it does. Take the Trinity as an illustration. It would certainly be a contradiction to say that one God is three Gods, and that three Gods are one God; or to say that one person is three persons, and that three persons are one person. This would come within the compass of reason, and would involve a contradiction, and could not be true. But this is not the Trinitarian doctrine. It involves no contradiction, because it holds that the three persons are one God, and the one God is three persons. They are not three in the same sense in which they are one, nor one in the same sense in which they are three. They are three in one sense, and one in another sense. In their personality they are three, in their Godhead they are one. It is surely as plain as the light of heaven that there is no contradiction here. The thing is incomprehensible because it is beyond our reason; but there is no contradiction in the matter. On the other hand, however, the doctrine of Transubstantiation comes perfectly within the province of, and

directly contradicts, our reason, and, therefore, cannot possibly be true. Its essential point is, that a piece of bread is changed into the real body, flesh, blood, and bones of Christ, whilst at the same time, according to the testimony of our senses of sight, touch, taste, hearing, and smelling, there is not the least change on it—it has all the qualities and properties of bread, and gives us no evidence whatever of being flesh, blood, and bones. Now, this is a point within the power of our reason, is perfectly cognisable to our senses, and as it is plainly contradictory to our senses and reason, it cannot possibly be true. No evidence could prove its truth. A contradiction cannot be true. It is different, however, with all the other doctrines I have been writing about. They are all above our reason, and may be true, and hence ought to be received as true on sufficient evidence. It is very foolish and quite unphilosophical to refuse to believe a thing merely because it is beyond our reason. To do so is to imagine that we are equal with God, who knows all things. We can understand many things; but there are thousands of things which we cannot comprehend. Let us not on this account foolishly imagine that they must be untrue. They may or may not be true for aught our reason can tell. If our reason were more perfect and more extended, we might understand many things which are now quite dark. Things which are incomprehensible to an idiot might be quite easily understood by a man like Sir

Isaac Newton. On the same principle, things which were incomprehensible to Newton might be as plain as the light of day to another man, provided only the Creator had endowed him with one or two additional reasoning faculties to those which Newton possessed. This is the right way to look at it. If one of our present reasoning faculties were taken from us, we would be unable to comprehend many things which we now understand. Would that make these things untrue, or be a proper reason for our denying their truth? Certainly not. They would only then be above the reason we possessed, and might be true for aught we could tell by reason. So, in the other case; the things which are above our present reason might be completely within our compass if we had another faculty added to our present stock. If God had created a man as far above Sir Isaac Newton as Newton was above an idiot, that man would be amused at the tiny efforts of our present puny intellects. Hence I conclude that, whilst we ought to reject everything which contradicts reason, because, being thus within its compass, we know it is untrue, we should never reject a properly-attested doctrine, which is free from contradiction, on the mere grounds of its being beyond the reach of our present reasoning faculties. This is the course which appears to me to be consistent with revelation as well as with genuine philosophy.

In expounding Scripture, there should be as little

repetition as possible. Turning up an argument in different aspects is quite right, because it is a very important method of catching different classes of intellect; but mere repetition is a complete waste of valuable time, and is an insult to the understanding of the hearers. If a man who spends the first quarter of the hour in recapitulating his previous discourse will only look at his audience, he will find that nearly all the hearers cease to think during the recapitulation, and open their ears only when new matter commences. The repetition of a thing which has been recently heard becomes dull, monotonous, and uninteresting. Some parties imagine that very low and very slow speaking has a good effect in solemnising the audience; but this is a great error. It has just the effect of allowing the brain to become perfectly lethargic, and may suit those who mistake absence of thought for intellectual devotion—a dead calm for spiritual worship. Under this sort of speaking, the minds of the hearers will wander to other subjects, as there is nothing to support sustained thought. Those who follow this method not only show an ignorance of the functions of man, but they also exhibit an indifference to the awful solemnity of the position in which they are placed before perishing souls. If a barrister be called on to address a jury on whose lips hang the life and death of a prisoner, how will he proceed? Will he act in a namby-pamby way, and drawl out his

words as if he were sick at stomach, and modulate his voice in such a delicate manner, that the first and last of his sentences are inaudible to the jury? No. He will get up all the fire, energy, and vigour of which his nature is capable; he will show that he is thoroughly in earnest and believes in his subject; he will cause his voice to ring through every corner of the building; and he will impress the jury by the weight, power, majesty, and force of the well-argued and touching appeal which he makes to their understanding and their feelings. He never permits their energies to flag, or their thoughts to wander from the subject of life and death which lies before them. Why, then, should the same course not be taken in divine things? Is human nature different in the meeting-house from what it is in the court-house? Is the temporal life more important than the eternal? Mr. Spurgeon is quite up to the mark on this point. Every word of his discourse is plainly heard throughout the "Tabernacle;" he uses no redundant words; his observations are intensely to the purpose; it is impossible to misunderstand him; he is evidently all in earnest; he is so much alive to the value of time, that he never loses a moment during the entire service; and the energies of his hearers, from the beginning to the end, are so sustained that thought is never interrupted. To me, his service is perfectly enchanting.

To speak in a perfectly natural voice is highly

important. "Scarcely one man in a dozen in the pulpit talks like a man," says Mr. Spurgeon. "This affectation is not confined to Protestants, for the Abbé Mullois remarks, 'Everywhere else, men speak ; they speak at the bar and the tribune ; but they no longer speak in the pulpit, for there we only meet with a factitious and artificial language and a false tone. This style of speaking is only tolerated in the Church, because, unfortunately, it is so general there ; elsewhere it would not be endured. What would be thought of a man who would converse in a similar way in a drawing-room ? He would certainly provoke many a smile. A man who has not a natural and true delivery should not be allowed to occupy the pulpit.' You may go all round, to church and chapel alike, and you will find that by far the larger majority of our preachers have a holy tone for Sundays. They have one voice for the parlour, and quite another tone for the pulpit ; so that, if not double-tongued sinfully, they certainly are so literally. The moment some men shut the pulpit-door, they leave their own personal manhood behind them. There they might almost boast with the Pharisee, that they are not as other men are, although it would be blasphemy to thank God for it."

The cerebral organs connected with observation and comparison are fairly developed in a vast majority of the human race ; but, if we except the Scotch and Germans, we cannot say the same thing in regard to

the faculties of concentration and abstract reasoning. Hence it is necessary for every public instructor to lighten his subject by suitable anecdotes, comparisons, and illustrations, drawn from history, natural science, and daily observation of the occurrences of life. It is perfectly competent for him to do all this without introducing unbecoming levity of any sort ; and if he be up to the mark, he will make his discourses extremely interesting and attractive, whilst his line of argument will be much more easily understood than if he kept to a dull process of mere abstract reasoning.

Above all things, thorough honesty of purpose is essential to the religious teacher. He should be above suspicion on every point. When called to the pastorate of a church, he should never accept if his sentiments differ from those of the church, unless he has first fairly and fully explained the points on which he differs. If he keep his peculiarities in the background until he has an opportunity of insidiously and gradually indoctrinating the people, he is thoroughly dishonest. I have known immense injury inflicted on churches in this way. Such cases result not only in direct injury to the parties immediately concerned, but they also usually inflict a severe blow on the cause of Christianity. A pastor should be straightforward and above-board on every point. When very young, a case came under my notice which made an indelible impression on my mind. I was sitting at a breakfast-

table in Dublin, when a minister, who was passing through the city, called for breakfast. The conversation was in no way restrained by my presence, as I was very little at the time. The minister had been to the south of Ireland for some time, supplying a congregation which was being diverted from the Trinitarian to the Unitarian Church. He was asked what were the prospects of success, and he replied that they were very poor indeed. He found fault with the seceding minister for having acted with precipitancy, and for want of judgment. He said, when the minister changed his sentiments on the Trinity, he announced the change to the congregation at once, and the consequence was he had few followers ; whereas, if he had taken what he considered the prudent plan, he would have kept his mind to himself, until, by gradually instilling his doctrines into the people, he had brought them round to his side of the question. In this way he would have secured success to his cause. Well, thought I, that may be your idea of religious propriety, but in my opinion there is not an honest bone in your body. There can be no comfort, harmony, or prosperity in a church, unless the minister and people are of one mind on all important points. With regard to things which are usually considered trivial, and on which the conscience of either party is not bound, there should be great caution and forbearance on the part both of pastor and people. It is no light matter

to break up the harmony of a church, or to create dissensions and divisions of any sort. It is not thought near so much of as it ought to be. If it ever be done, except under circumstances of the most decided necessity, it is a sin of a very high order—it is raising a direct obstacle to the prosperity of the cause of Christ.

“Men, now-a-days, occupy pulpits with the tacit understanding that they will uphold certain doctrines ; and from those very pulpits they assail the faith they are pledged to defend. The plan is not to secede, but to operate from within, to worry, to insinuate, to infect. Within the walls of Troy one Greek is worth half Agamemnon’s host ; let, then, the wooden horse of liberality be introduced by force or art, as best may serve the occasion. Talking evermore right boastfully of their candour, and hatred of the hollowness of creeds, &c., they will remain members of churches long after they have renounced the basis of union upon which these churches are constituted. Yes, and worse ; the moment they are reminded of their inconsistency they whine about being persecuted, and imagine themselves to be martyrs. If a person, holding radical sentiments, insisted upon being a member of a conservative club, he would meet with small sympathy if the members would not allow him to remain among them, and use their organisation as a means for overthrowing their cherished principles. It is a flagrant violation of liberty of conscience when a man intrudes himself into

a church with which he does not agree, and demands to be allowed to remain there and undermine its principles. Conscience he evidently has none himself, or he would not ignore his own principles by becoming an integral part of a body holding tenets which he despises ; but he ought to have some honour in him as a man, and act honestly, even to the bigots whom he so greatly pities, by warring with them in fair and open battle. If a Calvinist should join a community like the Wesleyans, and should claim a right to teach Calvinism from their platforms, his expulsion would be a vindication, and not a violation, of liberty. If it be demanded that in such matters we respect the man's independence of thought, we reply that we respect it so much that we would not allow him to fetter it by a false profession, but we do not respect it to such a degree that we would permit him to ride rough-shod over all others, and render the very existence of organised Christianity impossible. We would not limit the rights of the lowest ruffian ; but if he claims to enter our bedchamber the case is altered ; by his summary expulsion we may injure his highly-cultured feelings, and damage his broad views ; but we claim in his ejection to be advocating, rather than abridging, the rights of man. Conscience, indeed ! what means it in the mouth of a man who attacks the creed of a church, and yet persists in continuing in it ? He would blush to use the term conscience if he had any, for he is

insulting the conscience of all the true members by his impertinent intrusion. Our pity is reserved for the honest people who have the pain and trouble of ejecting the disturber: with the ejected one we have no sympathy: he had no business there, and had he been a true man, he would not have desired to remain; nor would he even have submitted to do so had he been solicited."—*Sword and Trowel* for November 1871.

I may, perhaps, take the liberty of referring to the course pursued by the Rev. Edward Dennett. In the year 1870, he published a Lecture against the Plymouth Brethren, in which he remarks that "it was to test these claims that we entered upon the task proposed this evening; but we had no idea of the labour thereby involved, for there is no *single* publication which contains their views, and hence we have had to read a host of pamphlets, to wade through shoals of their controversial writings, to sift and winnow the chaff from the wheat, to apply to 'Brethren' themselves for information; in fact, to adopt any and all possible means to arrive at an accurate knowledge of the subject. . . . We can, therefore, venture to give the assurance that not a single statement has been made without a most conscientious investigation of all the means of information placed within our reach." This is all as it should be. If the statements here be correct, he took nothing at random, nothing second-hand, nothing without the most careful investigation. Having read a host of their

pamphlets, having waded through shoals of their writings, having sifted the chaff from the wheat, and having applied to the "Brethren" themselves for information, he could not possibly have made any serious mistakes, if he intended to do justice, unless he was utterly incompetent for the task he undertook. If he had not natural capacity for understanding his subject, he should not have aspired to the position of a critic. What, then, in the light of the quotations I have made from his Lecture of 1870, are we to think of the statements he has published in his pamphlet of 1875, after he had openly joined the "Brethren"? The scene is entirely changed. He withdraws his Lecture from circulation; and, in so doing, he says, "The grounds of this withdrawal may be briefly stated. The writer made the discovery that some of the sources of his information, on which he had relied when the pamphlet was written, were untrustworthy; further and more authentic information concerning some of the circumstances with which he had dealt, constrained him to interpret them in a wholly different manner; an examination of the citations, which he had adduced in support of his statements, *in their context*, convinced him that he had imposed a meaning upon them foreign to their writers' intention." This is a state of matters which requires little comment. The case speaks for itself. The position is a most humiliating one.

In his first pamphlet or Lecture, before he was an

open Plymouth, he says, "We can venture to give the assurance that not a single statement has been made without a most conscientious investigation of all the means of information placed within our reach ;" but in his second pamphlet, after he became an avowed Plymouth, he says, "I sometimes suspected whether I had dealt quite fairly with them in criticising detached quotations ; whether, in fact, I had conscientiously sought to ascertain their real meaning, and to test it by the Scriptures." To reconcile these opposite statements about his conscientious investigations, is a task I must leave to himself—I could not undertake it.

After joining the "Brethren," Mr. Dennett lays down a principle of interpretation which is exactly suited to the awkward position in which he is placed. Instead of following the regularly-adopted course of interpreting every man's writings, whether secular or religious, by the fair and real meaning of the words which are used, he asserts that "the mind of the writer ought to govern the interpretation of a passage, even though a faulty style or laxity of expression might seem to admit of another meaning." Although this rule of interpretation is essential to all who adopt the system of Plymouthism, it is plain on the face of it that it has no valid foundation to rest on. How is the mind of the writer to be ascertained except by the words which he uses ? Can any one but God know what is going on in the mind ? If a man never uses a word, either in

writing or speaking, who can tell what the thoughts of his mind are? And if a man uses words in writing, is he not bound to use them in their proper meaning, in place of shuffling in the most disreputable manner so as to mystify his subject? What would be thought of the lawyer who would adopt Mr. Dennett's principles? If he were to come into court and acknowledge that the words of the Act of Parliament were against his client, but inasmuch as the mind of the writer of the Act might be entirely different from the words, he claimed the release of the prisoner, would he not be hooted as a madman and turned out of court? To be sure he would. It is only when some religious whim is to be served, that nonsense becomes sense.

In the first letter to his friend, in his pamphlet of 1875, Mr. Dennett says, "Some six years have now elapsed since our friendship was formed. . . . Its very commencement was a prediction of its nature and character, for it sprang out of fellowship in what we, at that time, held to be the truth. . . . What, then, was that position? Nominally we were Baptist ministers, but in spirit, and also in practice, we were outside the Baptist denomination altogether. . . . The effect of this was that we gave ourselves more heartily to the work of the Lord, striving to fence off our people as much as possible—though the task was very difficult—from denominational influences, to train them to the study of the Scriptures for themselves, and to build them up

in the truth of God. . . . *Our* hope was to continue with our people, and to have increased blessing resting upon us and our labours in their midst." What sort of conduct is this? What are we to think of men who are nominally one thing, while in spirit and in practice they are another? What are we to think of the system which will allow men, in place of resigning their charge, to stick on by their congregations in the hope of fencing off their people from the influence of the denomination to which these people honestly and professedly belong? What are we to think of the system which permits a man to look for God's blessing on such conduct? If there be one thing more important than another in a person professing to be a Christian minister—or, indeed, a Christian at all—it is thorough straightness of purpose. Jesuitical conduct should never exist under any pretence whatever.

Although it is incumbent on every Christian to act and speak with the greatest care, it is doubly important for the minister to do so, as small matters will sometimes influence his position. I once heard of a minister who was said to have paid almost daily visits to an old lady and gentleman named Little, who were hearers of his, and who possessed all the comforts of life, whilst a poor woman of the congregation had not been called on for eighteen months. At length the poor woman received a visit, and when she found fault with her minister for neglect of her, he replied that,

as she was all right on religious matters, she did not require attention, and he was obliged to spend all his spare time amongst those who had the greatest need of religious instruction. "Hech me!" said she, "if that be the case, Mistress Mettha Little maun be an awfu' sinner." This was a severe and deep rebuke for what the poor woman considered an evasive excuse for his conduct in neglecting his ministerial duty to the poor, whilst he had plenty of time to spend with the rich. Dean Ramsay tells the story of a Scotch lady, who, when told by her minister that he had got a call from the Lord to another part of the Master's vineyard, asked if there would be any improvement in his income. He said there would, and she at once replied, "I thocht as muckle. The Lord nicht hae ca'd loud an' lang, an' ye wudna heerd Him, gin' the steepen' had nae been better." Under certain circumstances, there can be no reason why a minister should not better his worldly position like any other man; but when he does so he should frankly acknowledge the fact, and stand on his privilege, rather than attempt to make people believe that he is actuated solely by a sense of duty to obey the call of God to another part of the vineyard. He would stand much better in the estimation of every person by acknowledging the plain truth. And this brings me to another point of some importance. It is admitted on all hands that a minister has a perfect right to change his place, if he has proper

reason to be dissatisfied with his people. There may also be various other motives which would justify a change. Full privilege is always conceded to him on this point. This is quite right ; but, on the other hand, there should just be the same privilege extended to the people. If a congregation wish to get rid of their minister, there should be no obstacle in their way. They should just find it as easy to get rid of their minister as their minister would to get clear of them. The facilities should be mutual. Are they found so in practice ? By no means. There are examples innumerable of crotchety ministers, and useless drones, sticking by a disaffected people until they have ruined the cause ; and when they ultimately leave, in place of seeing their own defects, they throw all the blame on the people. This is not as it should be. When a man finds himself without any success in a place, he should at once change his position to a more suitable spot, or else he should turn himself to some avocation for which he is better adapted than for the Christian ministry. Instead of charging the faults of the drones on the hearers, who are generally thirsting for knowledge, we should feel certain that the man who is spiritually-minded, consistent in his walk, sound in his doctrines, and "*apt to teach*," will not be left without success. As the rain watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth seed for the sower and bread for the eater, so the word of the Lord shall not return

void, but shall infallibly accomplish the purpose for which it is sent. God will bless His own institution.

I must now return from this long digression. Many parties have taken up the strange notion that they have a right to speak in the church whether they have been appointed to an office or not. This surely is an evidence of great presumption. They are to be the sole judges of their own qualifications ! If so, the fewer real qualifications they have, the higher will they rate themselves. There is no fear of such parties forming too mean an opinion of their own abilities. The sound of their voice charms themselves so much, that it must of necessity charm other people. I recollect once being present at a meeting where the propriety of listening to some individuals was considered. I singled out one of them, and proposed that it should be put to the vote of the members whether he was fit to edify them or not ; but he peremptorily refused to submit to the test ; he said he had a right to speak, and would speak. In other words, he was to be sole judge of his own powers, and those he was about to instruct must listen to him whether he edified them or not. This I looked upon not only as unscriptural, but also as a specimen of the most absolute tyranny that could be imagined. The witness, the counsel, the jury, and the judge were all to be rolled into his own sweet self. Such a state of matters could not be endured, and he found it convenient to join the Ply-

mouth Brethren, where he can ride and rule with undisputed sway. Autocrats of this description seem to forget the Scripture which says, "Let all things be done unto edifying." If this rule be not observed, the intentions of Scripture are frustrated. The church must be edified ; and I would like to know who is to judge of the capabilities of the speaker—whether or not he is "apt to teach"—if those who are to be edified are precluded from forming an opinion. "Those new-fangled religionists," says Mr. Spurgeon, "whose public worship consists of the prelections of any brother who chooses to jump up and talk, notwithstanding their flattering inducements to the ignorant and garrulous, usually dwindle away and die out ; because even men, with the most violent crotchety views, who conceive it to be the mind of the Spirit that every member of the body should be a mouth, soon grow impatient of hearing other people's nonsense, though delighted to dispense their own."

I have heard another idea about the Pastoral Office—that the pastor must be chosen out of the very individual church over which he is to be placed. Now, there is not a shadow of Scripture for such an opinion. The idea has arisen from confounding the election of deacons with the election of pastors. In regard to the election of deacons, they were told to choose out seven men among themselves, and hence a restriction arises on this point ; but with respect to the elders, or

pastors, there is not the slightest restriction at all. They were ordained in every church ; but whence they came, or to what place they belonged before they were chosen, we have not the shadow of information. They might have dropped from the moon, for aught we are told on the subject. Consequently, as the Scripture has laid down no rule on the point, we should not forge one to suit our own restricted ideas. We should just do as the Scripture authorises us—choose the pastors who possess the qualifications laid down, no matter to what place they belong, or whence they come.

Let it be specially observed that the foregoing remarks are in no way opposed to the proper exercise of any gifts which Christ may bestow on His Church. Every man is responsible for the exercise of whatever gift or talent has been conferred upon him. As Dr. Candlish has well observed, "It deeply concerns both himself and the Church, that he and the Church should find out what that is. And it is of deep concern also that, being found out, it should be used for the common good. . . . Every Christian should see to it that he recognises his own special gift, takes his own proper place, and does his own fitting work."—"Sermon before Free Church Assembly in 1862," pp. 15, 16.) It is the duty of every man to ascertain exactly what his own gift is, and then he should exercise it ; but it is also his very special duty to take care that he does not, through the inflations of pride and vanity, attempt to

encroach on the province of gifts which he has never received. This is the rock on which most men split. They are carried away on the tide of their own self-conceit. They seem to forget that while, on the one hand, they should make use of the gifts they have, on the other hand, it is positively and highly sinful to lay claim to the exercise of gifts which they do not possess. Such is the weakness of man that he cannot be trusted to be the sole judge of his own position in these matters, and, therefore, the Scripture has laid down the rule that the body of Christ (His Church) must be *edified*, and that all things are to be done *decently* and *in order*. Consequently it follows, as a matter of necessity, that *the parties* who are to be *edified* must be the judges of the gifts of those who presume to edify them. Under these circumstances, no person can claim a right to exercise *any* office in a church till he is first approved of by that church ; and if the church wishes to test any man's qualification for an office, it must be specially careful to adopt no course towards that end which could in the least encroach on the decency, order, and edification of the body. This is a point which must never be lost sight of, because it is the Scriptural rule for our guidance. It matters not how much a man may think of himself, he is here precluded from lording it over God's people, by saying he has liberty to exercise gifts which the Church has not recognised. This is both a scriptural principle and

an exceedingly wise one. If it were not for it, a church might be placed in a condition of the most abject slavery by some empty-headed creature who was incapable of seeing his own insignificance. The great evil of departing from Scriptural rule on this point is fully exemplified by the Plymouth Brethren, who are fulfilling the prediction of the apostle, when he says, "The time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." The miserable plight in which this deluded sect is placed is well exemplified in the lamentation of Mr. Mackintosh, which I have already quoted in this chapter, at the 88th page.

A Church of Christ is most aptly compared to the human body. As in the body every organ has its own special province, so in the Church every member has his own place. There is not a member in the Church but has some special sphere in which he can act, and for which he is endowed. Let him find out his place and then keep closely by it. The foot should not usurp the place of the eye, nor the hand of the ear. Every one should keep his own place and do his own duty, and then the whole body will be in good, healthy, and useful action. There will be a delightful harmony and beauty under those circumstances, which cannot be seen when all the members act as if they supposed

that the body is composed of only one organ—the *tongue*. When a person complains that there is no room allowed in a church for the exercise of gifts, let him be told that there is ample opportunity for the exercise of the gift of reproofing tattlers, healing breaches, promoting unity, assisting the poor, supporting the ministry, and paying towards the propagation of the gospel; and it will soon become evident that the gift of the “gab,” if I may use such an expression, is the only gift which he recognises in a Church of Christ. He will talk by the hour, but he will pay by the farthing. In words he might perhaps recognise the Pastoral Office, but in practice he will ignore it. There is one peculiar feature, as I have already said, about these sticklers for the exercise of imaginary gifts. If a pastor is to be chosen, a man equal to the Apostle Paul would hardly please them. They will examine, and examine, and examine into every shred of his composition; they will try him, and try him, and try him; they will turn him inside out, and outside in, and after all they would like three months more. But, if any person should propose that their own gifts should be well tested before being formally recognised, they will kick against it at once. Their talents are to be judged of by themselves, and must not be submitted to the vulgar crowd. These men have received the gift in their own eyes, and are infallible. They must be heard. They cannot submit to the mean or-

deal through which they drive the poor pastor. Of all tyrants, these are about the most despicable, because they tyrannise under the sacred name of religious liberty. Their entire conduct is ruled by their own self-conceit. Their pride is as great as their brains are empty.

At the 54th page of his "guarded" edition of "Notes on Leviticus," Mr. Mackintosh has some excellent observations on the duty of men who feel themselves called upon to resign their situations and go out to preach the gospel. But he has overlooked one point which I request he will inform us on. Suppose a man, who has no private income, devotes his life to the preaching of the gospel, how is he to be supported? If it be an unpardonable crime to take money openly for preaching the gospel, what is the poor fellow to do? If a rich man meets him on the street and says, "John, I am glad to hear you are busy preaching the gospel, and as I consider it my duty to assist in supporting you under the circumstances, here is a fifty pound note to you," is the man to say, "Get behind me, Satan," although he may chance to have a large and expensive establishment to support? Is he to refuse the reward of his labours, thus offered in an open, straightforward, and honest manner? But above all, is he to go home and pray to God for pecuniary assistance, and then intimate, by some means or other, that the fifty-pound note with which Satan was *openly* tempting him, would be considered a direct gift from

heaven, if it was only put in an envelope and dropped into the Post-office for him, without any intimation as to the source whence it came, or the purpose for which it was given? It is manifest, if he has no private income, he must live in one or other of these ways. Now, whether would he be acting more consistently with honour and high-minded integrity in holding out his right hand before his face, and openly and thankfully receiving the honest reward of his labour, or in slipping his left hand quietly behind his back, as the Plymouths do, in the hope that the money might be slipped into it, in a legerdemain fashion, in order that it might be called a gift from on high? To my mind, the one plan would be an evidence of manly principle; the other the indication of a low, sneaking disposition, which blushes not to insult the Majesty of Heaven. These Plymouths, however, are wise in their own generation, because their Jesuitical plan of support secures an income to the preachers far beyond anything they could obtain by straightforward, honest means.

Having thus given a concise statement of what I believe to be the teaching of Scripture regarding the existence, necessity, continuation, and support of a stated and settled Christian ministry, I shall now turn to the theory of the Plymouth Brethren concerning—

THE PRESIDENCY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

I WISH it to be specially observed that the statements I quote on this point are taken from the accredited writers amongst the Plymouth Brethren themselves. I thus gave them the fairest possible judgment, as all the witnesses are from their own side of the question. What more could they ask ?

At the 6th page of "Worship and Ministry," we are told that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit's "presence and *supremacy* in the assemblies of the saints" is one "of the most momentous truths by which the present period is distinguished ;" and the writer further says he could not "have fellowship with any body of professing Christians who substitute clerisy in any of its forms for the sovereign guidance of the Holy Ghost." It is also stated on the 7th and 9th pages of "Christ the Centre," that, from the moment the Holy Spirit was sent, "we search in vain in the New Testament for any Church government except the sovereign guidance of the Holy Ghost. . . . Enter an assembly belonging to any denomination of the present day . . . the PRESIDENCY of the Holy Ghost is forgotten : a man fills His place." Again, "No gathering can claim to be a Church of God, save that company that meets in the name of Jesus, and in the dependence upon the

presence, supply, and *ministry* of the Holy Ghost.”— (“The Lord’s Supper and Ministry.”) I need not multiply quotations, as these are quite sufficient to show that the special presidency of the Holy Spirit in the assemblies is a settled doctrine. Now, it is easy to prove that Christ has promised to be in the midst of His people when they are gathered in His name, although, be it observed, He nowhere says He is to be the president or pastor. On the contrary, we are expressly informed that He has given pastors and teachers; and we are told in other places that the elders or pastors are to feed the flock of God, and take the *oversight* thereof, and that those elders which *rule* well are to be counted worthy of double honour. Now, if the pastors are to oversee and rule the flock, it cannot be disputed that they occupy the position of presidents. This is the testimony of the inspired Word, and there is not a single text in all the Scriptures which states that the Holy Spirit is to be the *president* of the assemblies, or that He is even present in any other sense than as He dwells in individual believers. The Holy Spirit dwells in every Christian, either in the church meeting or out of it; but it cannot possibly follow from this, that the moment a number of them meet together, He becomes their president. This is a *positive* doctrine, and requires a positive, distinct, and unmistakable proof. Now, I demand of the Plymouths one text of Scripture in

which it is plainly taught that the Holy Spirit presides at the meetings of the Church. Until they produce such a text, and they have never yet done it, their system must be pronounced a pure fiction of the imagination. I have often wondered how men, no matter by what title they may be called, can consider themselves worthy of the name of man, so long as they hold that certain things are taught in the Scriptures, whilst they are unable to point to a single passage which explicitly teaches the doctrine. They will often hold to their belief, although, if a telescope seventeen times larger than Lord Rosse's were applied to every line in the book, it would not discover one word asserting the doctrine believed. Such conduct degrades the understanding, and brands the Word of God as if it were as unintelligible as a book of riddles.

As might be expected, this doctrine of Supremacy has driven these fanatics to wonderful extremes. They go the whole length of claiming inspiration for themselves. The author of "Worship and Ministry" says, page 9, "No one must take any part but that which He (the Holy Ghost) assigns. . . . Liberty of ministry is liberty for the Holy Ghost to act by whomsoever He will." According to this, the man who speaks, speaks under the direct presidency of the Holy Spirit, and must be infallible. "The choosing of pastors," says the writer of "The Ruined Condition of the Church," p. 25, "is a daring encroachment on the

authority of the Holy Ghost." I can well understand that God, and not man, has the power of *conferring* the gifts which are necessary for the pastoral office ; but I cannot understand how the Holy Spirit can choose the man, and then make His choice known to the world. This could not even be known by the parties chosen being inspired to tell it, because we would not know they were inspired. Besides, if the Holy Spirit is to *choose* the pastors, there is not the slightest necessity for the minute scriptural details regarding the qualifications for the office, because the Holy Spirit surely requires no information on this point. He needs no instructions. To my thinking, the fact that the Holy Spirit has thought it necessary to lay down in the Scriptures, in the most precise and particular manner, the various qualifications which are necessary for the man who desires to fill the office of a pastor or bishop, is an undeniable proof that he is to be chosen by uninspired men. If the choice rested with the Holy Spirit, he would require no instructions. Just think of the Holy Spirit requiring a printed list of qualifications to guide Him in His choice ! Just think of the Holy Spirit causing the instructions for His own guidance to be written down for fear He might forget them ! Plymouthism ! Plymouthism ! Even if the *choice* was to be made by inspired men there would be no necessity for details. The power of inspiration would enable them to point out the

man without a long list of instructions. Hence I conclude, as minute details are given concerning the qualifications, they cannot be intended either for the Holy Spirit or inspired men ; but must be for the guidance of ordinary mortals. If this be not so, the Scriptures contain more than is necessary—a useless superfluity—when they detail the qualifications which are requisite in the man who is to be selected to the office of a bishop.

The author of “The Ruined Condition of the Church,” at page 19, says, “It is remarkable that those companions of the apostle who possessed his confidence, were left in the churches, or else sent to them when already existing, in order to *select* such elders—a clear proof that the apostle could not confer upon the churches the power of *choosing* their elders ;” and the writer of the tract called “The Brethren” says, p. 17, “As to elders, then, an apostle *chooses*” (Acts xiv. 23). This is entirely new light to me. As my Bible contains no such statement, there must be some version of the Scriptures which I have never yet beheld. It must be the Plymouth, or forged, version. My Bible informs me that “those companions of the apostle,” and the apostle himself, *ordained* elders in the churches, but it nowhere states that they *selected* or *chose* them ; and this makes all the difference in the world. There is not one word in the whole compass of inspiration which states that the elders were

selected or chosen by inspired men, nor is there a single iota to lead us to such a supposition. On the contrary, as I have already observed, the minute qualifications which are detailed must be taken as a conclusive proof that the elders were to be selected by uninspired men, who required proper and full instructions for their guidance. At the 18th page of his "Inquiry into the Sabbath, the Law, and the Ministry," Mr. Mackintosh asks, "Why was not the church at Ephesus, or why were not the churches at Crete, directed to *elect* or appoint elders? Why was the direction [to *elect*] given to Timothy and Titus, without the slightest reference to the Church or to any part of the Church?" In place of answering this, I just ask Mr. Mackintosh, why will he state a thing to be in the Scriptures which he knows is not in the Scriptures? He here states that Timothy and Titus were *directed* to *elect* the elders, whereas he must know that there is no such direction in the whole Bible. They got no instructions whatever to *elect* or *choose*, but they got instructions to *ordain*. I can hardly give Mr. Mackintosh credit for sufficient stupidity to warrant the supposition that he could confound the choosing of a man with the ordaining of him after he is chosen, as if both meant the very same thing. He must be selected or chosen before he can be ordained. The rule of Scripture is as plain as possible. The members of the church, who are to choose their office-

bearers, are not inspired, and, therefore, they require, and have received, very minute instructions regarding the necessary qualifications of candidates. If these instructions are carefully followed out, they will point at once to the parties who have received the necessary gifts from the Great Head of the Church, and these should be chosen, or elected, by the church over which they are to be placed as rulers and teachers. The Church is to be ruled and taught, and the pastors must be capable of ruling properly, and be "apt to teach." It is lamentable to think that the three writers from whom I have quoted assert that the elders were selected, elected, or chosen, by inspired men, although the Scriptures contain no such statement. It is truly awful to think of the way in which the Plymouths deal with revelation. They profess great reverence for it, and then put on a very sanctimonious garb, and twist, turn, add to, alter, and torture it in every direction which may please their fancy.

Mr. Darby asks, "If God is there, is He not to make His presence known? If He do, it is a manifestation of the Spirit in the *individual who acts*; it is a gift, and, if you please, an *impulse*. It is God *acting*, that is the great point."—"Presence and Operation of the Spirit," p. 21, as quoted by Mr. Govett.) If this be not touching on inspiration, I know not what is. If the man acting be God acting,

he must be inspired and infallible. If the man's action be a manifestation of the Holy Spirit ; if it be the result of a direct *impulse* from the Holy Spirit, he should not only not be appealed from, but his decision should, on no account, be questioned, because he is the direct and infallible mouthpiece of the Almighty. "To hinder any *movement of the Spirit*," says the author of "The Lord's Supper and Ministry," "when the saints come together into one place, or to tie down that movement to any defined system in our thoughts, is to quench the Spirit." Again, "It is not sobriety, as a Christian, to overlook or deny the present *direct guidance*, by the Lord through His Spirit, of His *disciples*, as being something over and above the written Word."—"Present Testimony," p. 56, quoted by Mr. Govett.) Further, "We meet on the principle that God the Holy Ghost (who dwells in believers individually, and in the body collectively) *alone has a right to speak in the meeting*, and He has a right to speak by whom He will."—(*Torquay statement*. See Govett.) These not only claim inspiration for the interpretation of the inspired writings, but they go the whole length of claiming inspiration for all that is said at the meetings. If their acting be God acting ; if their impulse be the Spirit's impulse ; if hindering the movement be quenching the Spirit ; if the disciples have the direct guidance of the Lord by His Spirit, and if the Spirit alone speak in the

meeting, it must follow, as a matter of necessity, that every syllable uttered is really inspired. If these men speak as they are moved by the Holy Spirit, they are quite on a par with the prophets of old, whose prophecy came not by the will of man ; “but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.” On their own showing, the Plymouths are as thoroughly inspired as were the prophets of ancient days. There is not the slightest difference. They are far beyond the reach of the instructions given in the New Testament. “If any man speak,” say the Scriptures, “let him speak as the oracles of God.” Here it is the man who is to speak ; but amongst the Darbyites the man is only to stand up for the Holy Spirit to speak through him. Here the man is to speak in accordance with the oracles of God, but every Darbyite is an oracle of the Holy Spirit. We are told the Jews had a great advantage, “because that unto them were committed the oracles of God ;” but we of Great Britain have a far greater advantage, because we have Oracle Darby alive and in our midst ! [Mr. Darby died in the year 1882.] “If any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth.” Here again, it is the man who is to minister ; but the Plymouths say they “meet on the principle that God the Holy Ghost alone has a right to speak in the meeting.” Here again, the man-minister is to minister as of the ability which God giveth, and this

must include every sort of ability which he possesses, whether by his natural or spiritual birth, because he possesses no sort of ability whatever but what he has received from God ; but, on the Darbyite view, a man should not use his own natural powers at all, as he is only to be the passive instrument of the Holy Spirit. When the greatest fool in the assembly gets up, he is no more to be questioned than if he were the Apostle Paul, because it is an example of the Holy Spirit using whom He pleases. The Scripture which directs that a pastor must have the endowment of being “apt to teach” must not be attended to, for these new-light divines have discovered that the only thing necessary is to watch the “movement of the Spirit.” As a quaint old man once said to me, “They must start up when the Spirit *jags* them.” That these views, however inconsistent they may be with some others of their statements, are really held by the Darbyites, is incontrovertibly manifest from the quotations I have made, as well as from the following extract, which has been taken by Mr. Govett and Dr. Tregelles from Mr. Haffner :—“That the practical denial of the presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church existed at Ebrington Street, I am fully assured. . . . My assurance of this arises from a conversation I had with Mr. Newton, just before leaving Plymouth, on the subject of preparation for ministry, when he said, that before coming to the Lord’s table he did not see it at all wrong *to be prepared with what*

he had to say to the saints. . . . This, beloved friends, shocked me much, very much, at the time, and shook my confidence. . . . Our poor brother did thus practically deny the present leadings and guidance of the Spirit of God." He did not wait to be inspired in the assembly !

If the Darbyite principles be correct, no false views, or views inconsistent with each other, could ever be taught in the assemblies. A contradiction could never occur. I shall revert to this point presently. "Instead of looking immediately to one man, the Spirit should be waited upon, to minister through whom He pleased."—"Reasons for Leaving the Moravians," p. 26.) Quite right, if they are all inspired. "The manifested judgment of the Spirit of God in one gathering of saints is *valid for all*."—"Present Question," p. 39, as quoted by Mr. Govett.) Correct again on their own theory ! If the Spirit of God inspires one assembly to deliver a particular judgment, all other assemblies should consider the decision valid and infallible. It would certainly be a very ticklish affair to try the inspired men in various Plymouth assemblies on the same point, as the consequences of a variety of adverse decisions from a number of tribunals under the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit would be dreadful to contemplate. Hence it is a wise thing to lay down the rule that one decision is valid for all.

Let us now see how far their practice bears out their theory of the sovereign guidance, movements, and presidency of the Holy Spirit in their assemblies. Of course, if the Holy Spirit preside, he will keep due order, and effectually prevent the intrusions of Satan and of man. The Holy Spirit is surely too powerful as a president to permit us to think that it is possible for Him to be overcome by either man or devil. Such a thought would be blasphemous. How, then, is it with these fanatics? I have already quoted, at page 88, the very emphatic lamentation of Mr. Mackintosh regarding the conduct of some parties in the assemblies. Just think of the awful impiety of charging the Holy Spirit with presiding in the meeting under such circumstances.

"I confess to you, my brethren," says the author of "Worship and Ministry," p. 18, "when some time ago we had five or six chapters read, and as many hymns sung, around the Lord's table, and perhaps not more than one prayer or giving of thanks, it did occur to me whether we had met to improve ourselves in reading and singing, or to show forth the Lord's death." If the Spirit was presiding, this must have been all correct, and the writer is far astray when, in the next sentence, he says he unfeignedly blesses God an improvement has since taken place. Just think of this! An improvement has taken place in what was presided over and guided by the Holy Spirit!!

“It is in this way,” says Mr. Goodall, “the agency of the London Bridge meeting (now Salter’s Hill) is working—on the one hand superseding and suppressing local responsibility, and on the other usurping the authority of the Holy Ghost in the Church by its ecclesiastical documents.”—(“Walworth and Priory Correspondence,” p. 20.) An undoubted proof of inspiration! “The Woolwich Assembly having in February 1861, without *waiting for a trial* and in the *absence of evidence*, . . . on *ex parte* statements, pronounced Mr. Stewart to be excommunicate, thus practically denying the unity of the body and the presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church, to our common shame and humiliation.”—(“Walworth and Priory Correspondence;” Introduction, p. 3.) Who can doubt the Spirit was presiding!! “On the 23rd November 1860, a printed circular was issued, containing charges against Mr. Stewart of ‘untruthfulness, dissimulation, and unrighteousness,’ signed on behalf of the Brethren meeting at Zoar Chapel, Jersey, ‘Henry Bullock and Philip Denize.’”—(“Statement of Jersey Case,” by Mr. Eland, p. 1.) In relation to this, Dr. Currie of Jersey writes, “I believe the charges brought against Mr. Stewart *utterly false*, and that he made every effort to have an opportunity of proving them so.”—(“Jersey Case,” by Mr. Eland, p. 12.) If the Spirit be acting, how do Mr. Bullock and Dr. Currie deliver such opposite statements?

"Suffice it to say," says Mr. Stewart, in his "Appeal," pp. 14-34, "that the whole of this shameful procedure was got up by a faction, fed and fostered into an exaggerated form by *dissimulation* and for a well-understood purpose. . . . The table was set up there more as a matter of convenience than of principle. . . . No pen could describe how for fourteen years the poor saints of God have been worried and perplexed in Jersey. . . . Whenever a dishonourable action is to be done, one has not far to go to find an agent. . . . How was this brought about? Through 'the cunning craftiness of men, whereby they lie in wait to deceive,' aided by the counsels and appeals of *plausible sanctimoniousness*. . . . Is it come to this pass, brother Darby, that injustice, banished from the slaveholders of America, has found an asylum in the bosom of the Brethren? . . . I do not believe that any religious body could be found—unless it be the Mormons—where such a wanton outrage could be offered with impunity to *truthfulness and honour*." Who would now dare to doubt the presidency of the Spirit!!! "The excitement and confusion," says Mr. Culverhouse, in his "Statement as to the Jersey, Guernsey, and London Case," pp. 5, 10, "which prevailed at the conference, precluded, I regret to state, *all sober investigation*. . . . It is impracticable, dear brethren, to describe the true state of things, either in the gatherings or at the conference. Every remonstrance

is unheeded. . . . Insinuations, slanders, insolence, threats, and violence are resorted to. . . . I designate it an inquisition. . . . At the meeting of the 21st instant the doors were guarded and locked. A brother, on applying for entrance, was seized by the throat and thrust back." Undoubted proof of the presidency of the Holy Spirit!! Is the idea not blasphemous? Now, who are members of this conference? "Our brethren, Mr. Darby, Mr. Wigram, Dr. Cronin, and Mr. Lean," says Mr. Culverhouse, "are the chief and ruling members. . . . Was not the Priory literally reduced to a mere theatre? . . . Theatrical matters can only be expressed in theatrical terms, and this, brethren, is my excuse for such allusions." I have received a long letter from the person alluded to by Mr. Culverhouse as having been seized by the throat. He gives a most lamentable account of the sect. He says, "On entering the meeting one Saturday night I was seized by my throat by Mr. —, and nearly strangled; and I bore for several days the marks of this old gentleman's talons in my neck; and yet this old gentleman is allowed still to teach. This account you will find recorded in Mr. Culverhouse's pamphlet, for he was there, and examined my neck. . . . Several sisters rushed out in great fear and alarm; one said, 'It was like a menagerie of wild beasts.' . . . I am extremely glad that I have been delivered from the worst sect that a Christian man can meet with under the canopy

of heaven. . . . They pretend to be wholly led by the Holy Spirit, *whereas all things are arranged beforehand—who shall lecture, who shall pray, who shall give out hymns.*” I take these extracts out of a letter containing sixteen pages of similar, or worse, matter, for the purpose of letting my readers understand how some of these “garotting gatherings” are conducted. If the Darbyites wanted to prove the presidency of the Devil at these meetings, the task would be an exceedingly easy one; but to say they were presided over, and directed by, the Spirit of God, is about as unblushing a piece of blasphemy as ever was uttered by mortal man.

Mr. Groves, who was one of the chief founders of Plymouthism, foresaw the condition into which his party were certain to fall, and thus warned them in the year 1836:—“Your government will soon become one wherein is overwhelmingly felt the authority of men. . . . The position which this occupying the seat of judgment will place you in, will be this—the most narrow-minded and bigoted will rule, because his conscience cannot and will not give way, and therefore the more enlarged heart must yield.”—(Appendix to the Life of Groves.) The truth of these observations has long since been fully verified. One of Dr. Bell’s correspondents writes concerning Jersey:—“I found that divisions and differences had crept in among those Christians who meet in this simple way,

and that there were three separate meetings in St. Helier's, none of them walking towards each other in that spirit which becometh saints. . . . How these disputes and fleshly strivings about questions, oftentimes to no profit, have distracted the Brethren from one end of the country to the other!"—(*Earthen Vessel*, March 2, 1863.) Is not this a direct charge against the Holy Ghost, who is said to be presiding where these quarrels originate? It surely is.

Mr. Mackintosh, in "Now and Then," p. 11, calls Christ "the heavenly Man;" but Mr. Newton (see "Bethesda," by Mr. Trotter, pp. 4, 5) says "'Christ was exposed, because of His relation to Adam, to that sentence of death that had been pronounced on the whole family of man.'—('Observations,' by B. W. N., p. 9.) He was represented as 'exposed to that curse,' and 'to the doom of man.' It was taught," continues Mr. Trotter, "that in consequence of Christ's relation to Adam, His own relation, as a man, to God, was such, that for the first thirty years of His life the hand of God was stretched out, rebuking Him in anger and chastening Him in hot displeasure. . . . Mr. N. taught, that from these *nonsubstitutional* sufferings Christ emerged, either at His baptism by John, or at the cross itself. In short, the doctrine held was such, that one who had been delivered from it remarks, in his printed confession, how it must, if true, have disqualified Christ 'for becoming *our* surety, *our* sacrifice,

our Saviour, for He had to extricate Himself!'" Now, I ask, if the Holy Spirit is moving, speaking, and presiding ; if, as Mr. Darby says, it is God acting, how can such opposite doctrines, on a vital point, as those which were broached by Mr. Mackintosh and Mr. Newton, originate in the assembly, or be taught ? Impossible ! utterly impossible ! It is not the shadow of an excuse to say these parties have now separated, because they were in full fellowship with the Brethren at the time the above opinions were promulgated. Their separation afterwards does not in the least affect the question I am discussing, except that it bears still more strongly in my favour. If the Spirit had really been presiding and speaking through them, false doctrines and opposite opinions could never by any possibility have *arisen*. If such a thing were to occur under the influence and presidency of the Spirit, the sin would be directly chargeable on the Spirit of God. It would make Him the originator of false doctrines and contrary opinions. It is, therefore, impossible that the Spirit could be acting and presiding under such circumstances. Indeed, with all the boast of the Darbyites about the presidency of the Spirit, it is evident they do not fairly believe it themselves, *because they have separated from Mr. Newton on account of the views which he is said to have publicly taught in the assembly*. Their own conduct gives the flattest contradiction to their honest belief in their own statements. In place of separating

from Mr. Newton on account of what Mr. Darby, in his reply to Mr. Trench, calls "abominable blasphemies," they should have received everything he said as infallible, seeing that the Spirit presides at the assemblies, and that the acting of the members is God acting. Mr. Ryan, at page 15 of his pamphlet, charges Mr. Darby with "*altering the Word of God*, without any authority whatsoever, upon a famous passage which affects the very foundation of the faith itself—Christ's divinity." He also charges Mr. Mackintosh with "the old Monophysite heresy"—the heavenly humanity. Now, if Mr. Newton, Mr. Darby, Mr. Ryan, and Mr. Mackintosh all faithfully and fully taught their own views, which they were honestly bound to do, in the assemblies of the Brethren, during the time they were in connection, I want to know how the Spirit was presiding while they were giving out contradictory opinions on the most vital points in Christianity. Could the Holy Spirit speak through them and give out contradictory opinions? Could the Holy Spirit preside and permit, what no *man* would permit, false doctrines to be uttered? Just think of Mr. Darby holding that the Spirit was presiding in the assembly at the very time when Mr. Newton was promulgating opinions which are characterised by Mr. Darby as "abominable blasphemies"!! Just think of the position of Mr. Darby, who, in accordance with his own system, is absolutely bound to hold that these "abominable

blasphemies" are the actual utterances of the Holy Spirit, because he says, "it is a manifestation of the *Spirit* in the individual who acts . . . it is God acting!!"

I fully concur in the following sentiments from my father. "The Holy Spirit," says he, in his "Principles of Biblical Interpretation," p. 235, "teaches only what in words is revealed in the Scriptures; and only through the words. It is necessary for every Christian to have clear and precise notions on this subject; for the teaching of the Holy Spirit is capable of being misrepresented and most dangerously perverted by enthusiasm. It has been so perverted, to the disgrace of Christianity, and to the beguiling of unstable souls. The tide of fanaticism that has lately set in upon Britain, and which threatens to roll over the world, has been raised by false views of the teaching of the Holy Spirit. This deludes many; but still more are furnished with a plausible pretence to renounce the doctrine of the Spirit's teaching, or to keep it out of view as a dangerous doctrine. But the success of the forgery only shows the value of the original; and he is not wise who will not look to God as a guide because some fanatics choose to go astray under the false pretence of that guidance. Let us avoid errors on the right and errors on the left. There is no safety but in implicitly following the Word. It is in this only that we are encouraged to expect the enlightening and

constant guidance of the glorious Spirit of Truth. The Scriptures are the Word of God, and He honours them in His teaching by employing them to enlighten the mind of the sinner, and carry on the education and instruction of the believer. He teaches nothing without them. To enlighten the mind of the sinner by the knowledge of Christ, or to instruct the Christian in the truths and duties of Christianity, without or beyond the Scriptures, would represent the Scriptures as unnecessary or deficient. Whoever pretends to learn from God anything as to the truths or duties of Christianity, but through His Word, has a spirit of fanaticism. This peculiarity in the teaching of the Spirit through the word of the Spirit is the great safeguard which we have against the delusions of Satan and the dreams of a crazy imagination. The Spirit of God teaches only what is contained in the Scriptures, and this He always teaches through the means of the Scriptures. . . . Though all Christians are taught by the Spirit, it does not follow that they are taught the true meaning of every passage of the Word of God. Indeed, the doctrine of the teaching of the Holy Spirit, properly understood, affords no evidence that they are correct in their explanation of any passage whatever. The truth of their explanation must rest on the arguments by which they support it, and not on the pretensions to divine teaching. The explanation of every uninspired man must be received

no farther than it is seen to be the necessary result of the words of inspiration. . . . Implicit acquiescence in the explanations of Scripture by any uninspired man is a disgrace to human understanding, and an insult to God. . . . No man has a right to say, as some are in the habit of saying, The Spirit tells me that such or such is the meaning of such a passage. How is he assured that it is the Holy Spirit, and that it is not a spirit of delusion, except from the evidence that the interpretation is the legitimate meaning of the words? The lying spirits spoke of old through the false prophets, with all the usual formalities of the true prophets of God." Such are the views regarding the operations of the Spirit, which I believe to be in strict accordance with Scripture. They avoid infidelity on the one hand, and fanaticism on the other.

How far this Plymouth sect has gone aside from the opinions of its original founders may be gathered from the following sensible observations of Mr. Groves, regarding impulsive ministry:—"I tell them it is of the same class of errors as those which characterise Popery (see 1 Timothy iv. 3); being an attempt to set up a higher standard of holiness than God's; and must end, like theirs, in deeper sin. We as little deny the truth of God's promise, that our bread and water shall be sure, by going to our daily work to earn it, as we do that of the Spirit's help, by studying God's Word in dependence on His guidance in order to minister to

others. We have no more reason to expect the bread of life to be miraculously supplied to us for feeding others, than we have the natural bread; natural understanding is given us to obtain the one, and spiritual understanding to attain the other; thus Paul's exhortation to Timothy, that in order that his profiting should appear in all things, he should *give* himself to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine; he should meditate upon those things, and give himself wholly to them" (Life of Groves).

THE LAW A RULE OF LIFE.

It is a most glorious fact that the life and death of Christ have brought us into a state of Christian liberty—the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free. The Darbyites have taken advantage of this fact to ignore law as the rule of our life. The man who claims exemption from law on the ground that Christ in life has obeyed it in his stead, might exhibit a semblance of consistency, although in error; but it would be impossible to imagine anything more inconsistent than the conduct of these Plymouths in claiming exemption from all law, whilst they deny that they have obeyed it on their own part, or that Christ has obeyed it for them. If they have not obeyed law on their own behalf, and if Christ has

not rendered obedience to it in their stead, how are they to be exempted from it in any point of view? Their only consistent course is to deny law in every shape and form;—whether contained in the Scriptures or written on the heart. They will then be able to dispense with Christ both in His life and in His death. If there be no law, there is no transgression and no need of a Saviour.

But I will not admit that, on account of the obedience of Christ, the Christian is released from the moral law as the rule of his life. He is released from it as the procuring cause of his justification, and as the grounds of his condemnation, before God, because Christ has rendered, in his room and stead, that perfect obedience, in life and in death, which he was unable to give. In this point of view, he is not under law, but under grace. It is perfectly true that, “by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified.” But why is this the case? Is it owing to any defect in law itself? Certainly not. Righteousness, or justification, would undoubtedly result from a perfect obedience to law, because we are expressly told that “the doers of the law shall be justified.” It is not, then, on account of any defect in law itself that no flesh shall be justified by its deeds, but it is entirely and solely on account of our utter inability to render that perfect obedience which law demands. The defect is all in ourselves. We cannot

be justified by the deeds of law, because we are not able to obey it aright, and because we have broken it already.

It is not only true that by the deeds of the law no flesh shall be justified, but it is also true that every man in the world is under law in some respect ; that is to say, he is under the law as written in the book, or under the law as written in the heart ; either the one or the other ; and that comes practically to about the same thing. Although the Gentiles had not the law written in the book, they had the law written on the heart, and, therefore, the Apostle Paul says, they show the work of "the law" written in their hearts. "For when the Gentiles," says the Scripture, "which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves ; which show the work of the law written in their hearts. . . . We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin. . . . Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." From this it is evident that all men are under law, whether written on the heart or revealed in the Scriptures. If there be any man in the world who is not under law, the passages I have here quoted could not be true. "Where no law is, there is no transgression. . . . For sin is the transgression of

the law ;" hence both Jews and Gentiles, who are said to be "all under sin," must be all under law, whether we call it the law written in the heart or revealed in Scripture. That the whole human race is under law is evident from the fact, that every mouth is to be stopped, and all the world is to become guilty before God. There is no possible escape from this. No son of Adam can be exempted. It extends to every mouth and all the world. If, then, we are all under law, either written on the heart or revealed, how does it come that we are not under law, but under grace? There must be a sense in which both these things are true, as they are Scripture doctrines. The passages I have just quoted prove that every man in the world is under law. In what sense, then, is he not under it? Just in the sense that the work of Christ has released him from it as the procuring cause of his justification and as the grounds of his condemnation, but in no other sense. Christ has done for His people what they could not do for themselves. He has rendered perfect obedience, in their place, to the law in His life, and paid the full penalty of the transgression in His death, and in this way He has provided, and bestowed on them, a complete robe of righteousness which releases them from the law, as the procuring cause of their justification and as the grounds of their condemnation. They are not justified by the deeds of the law, but by the righteousness of Christ

imputed to them; and they cannot be condemned by the law, because Christ has paid the penalty in their room and stead.

The work of Christ has released the believer from law as the procuring cause of his justification. In this point of view, he is not under law, but under grace. It by no means follows, however, that he is not under the moral law as the rule of his life. That is quite a different question. In fact, we are expressly told by the apostle that we are "not without law to God, but under the law to Christ." This is surely plain enough. Paul further informs us that he "delights in the law of God after the inward man." Now, how could he delight in the law of God, if he is not in any sense under it? If the Christian is not under the obligations of the moral law as the rule of his life, he is in no sense bound by it. He may break it continually, and commit every crime in the calendar. In fact, lying, murder, and theft would cease to be crimes, because there would be no law against them, either in the heart or in the Book. Christ obeyed the law on our behalf, in order that we might be clothed in a robe of spotless righteousness; but He never obeyed it in order that we might be set free from all obligation to the moral law, and be permitted to live in a lawless and libertine condition. If the obedience of Christ's life were a sufficient warrant for our release from all obligations to law as a rule of our life, on the very

same mode of reasoning the atonement effected by the death of Christ on the cross would be a sufficient warrant for our continuance in sin. If the argument holds good in the one case, it is equally good in the other. Under these circumstances, of all men in the world, the Christian would have the greatest liberty for indulging in sin with impunity. He would be the only man in society who would be released from the obligations of morality. In place of releasing us from all obligation of law to God, the work of Christ should make us more anxious to obey. We should neither put forth the obedience of Christ's life as a reason for our release from the moral law as the rule of our life, nor claim the atonement of Christ as an argument for our continuance in sin. Instead of taking us entirely from under law to God, Christ has given us additional reasons for obedience. The Scripture says we are "not without law to God, but under the law to Christ." How, then, can any man say we are freed entirely from law as the rule of our life? If we are not without law to God, we are surely under law to God. We are not under law to procure us life or salvation; but we are under law as the rule by which we should live. These two things are entirely distinct, and the distinction should never be lost sight of. It is for want of making a proper discrimination of points which differ that errors so frequently abound.

On this point Mr. Darby certainly goes far enough.

He says, "Men before Moses, Gentiles since, and Christians now, are not under law." This is a very sweeping assertion. It does not stop short with that portion of law which was confined to the Jews ; but it includes law of every description, whether written on the heart or revealed in Scripture. It makes no exception. The term is thoroughly general—"not under law." Besides, it is announced in his own special dictatorial style. It requires no evidence to sustain it. Darby has announced it, and all his followers must believe it. Those, however, who tremble at the Word of God, will take a different view. What saith the Scripture? "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law ; for sin is the transgression of the law." This puts every *sinner* under law. The man who is not under law is not under sin, if this passage be true. "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves ; which show the works of the law written in their hearts." Take care, Paul. You here place the Gentiles under the law written on the heart ; but the apostle Darby knows far better, for he clears the Gentiles of every sort of law. On this point Darby is an infallible authority, and Paul must hide his diminished head. At another place, Paul, you say that, by the things which the law saith, every mouth is to be stopped, and all the world is to become guilty before God ; but

here, again, Darby is a master for Paul, for he has discovered that "Men before Moses, Gentiles since, and Christians now," are not included in the world which is thus to become *guilty* before God. Harmless people ! Further, Paul, you say you have "proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin," and consequently that, as being all under sin, they are all under law, in accordance with another statement of yours, that "Where no law is, there is no transgression. . . . For sin is the transgression of the law." Here, again, however, Darby confronts you, for he holds that a large portion of the world is not under law at all ; and as a necessary result of this, he is fairly bound to hold that "Men before Moses, Gentiles since, and Christians now," *are not under sin* ; or else he must dispute your premises that "Where no law is, there is no transgression." On Mr. Darby's principles, a Christian might *practise sin* to any extent without breaking any law, either written on the heart or revealed in Scripture ; for he says most emphatically, at the 21st page of "Righteousness and Law," that in the 6th of Romans "the apostle declares there, *as to practice, or to sinning*, we are not under law." Hence it is indisputable that, on Darbyite principles, a man may commit the greatest crime in the calendar without violating any law of God. This is glorious news for the libertines. It also fully accounts for the extremely low state of truthfulness which exists in many instances amongst the Plymouths,

if I am to give the slightest credence to the information which has been furnished me by parties who have had experience of the sect. If the reports which have reached me be correct, it is absolutely necessary for some of these people to be released from the obligations of the moral law as the rule of their life.

That we are "not without law to God, but under the law to Christ," is in perfect accordance with the idea of the apostle, when he asks, "Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid! How shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? As Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." The same ideas I have been inculcating in regard to our being released from the law as the procuring cause of our justification, and as the grounds of our condemnation, although we are not released from its moral obligations as the rule of our life, are contained in this passage. We are said to be "dead to sin." Now, in what respect are we dead to sin? No man can say we are in every respect dead to sin; but still there must be some view in which we are truly dead to sin, because the Scripture states it. What, then, is this view? It must certainly be that we are dead to, or freed from, the guilt and consequences of sin. This is the only view which could possibly be true. It could not possibly mean that we are dead to the power, the allurements, and the tempta-

tions of sin, because this would directly contradict, as a matter of fact, the experience of every Christian in the world. The man who joins Mr. Darby in saying he is removed completely from the power, the allurements, and the temptations of sin—as completely as if he were a dead man—knows nothing of what it is to be a Christian. He knows nothing of the experience of the apostle Paul, or of the Christian's warfare. There is no such state of sinless perfection in this life. If such were the case, the Christian could not possibly fall into any sort of sin, or be affected by it, or backslide. This new-light doctrine of total death to the power of sin was unknown to the apostle when he said, "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted." It is evident Paul was behind the Darbyite improvements of this generation, because he thought the brethren were liable to temptation, and, therefore, were not like dead men in relation to the power of sin. If this advanced theology were correct, we could not possibly be tempted, or backslide. We would be absolutely perfect. There would not be the slightest necessity for watching against temptation. It would be superfluous to pray to be kept from the temptations of the devil, the world, and the flesh. If we did so, we would be praying to be delivered from a thing which it was impossible for us, as dead men, to fall

into. I unhesitatingly conclude, then, that when Scripture says we are dead to sin, and dead to the law, it means no more than that we are dead to the guilt and consequences of sin, and dead to the justification and condemnation of the law, on account of what Christ has done in our room and stead. The man who argues that we are entirely released from the obligations of the moral law, as the rule of our life, because it is said that we are dead to the law, is bound in consistency, by the same rule of interpretation, to hold that we are without sin in word, deed, or thought—in a state of absolute sinless perfection—because it is said that we are dead to sin. Consistency demands that the Darbyites shall go this length ; and I am quite willing to leave the whole question to be settled by the judgment of the public as to how far the parties who compose the sect are to be considered as incapable as a dead man of sin in word, deed, and thought. When their deeds shall establish this state of sinless perfection in the eyes of the public, I will give up the controversy.

In place of telling the brethren at Rome that they were released from the moral law as the rule of their life, Paul says, at the 9th verse of the 13th chapter, "Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet ; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

If Paul had had a wholesome fear of the Plymouth Brethren before his eyes, he would not in this palpable manner have told the Christians at Rome that they were to regulate their lives by those precepts of the moral law ; and it is very evident to me that the Plymouths do not incline to keep this law, for in place of loving me as themselves, most of them, as far as I have had an opportunity of judging, hate me with a most perfect hatred ; and I feel very certain, if they had the power, they would persecute me with a most thorough persecution. Consequently, I conclude that they do well to release themselves from the obligations of the moral law.

“Again,” says Mr. Mackintosh, “we read, ‘And the commandment which was ordained to life I found to be *unto death*.’ It evidently did not prove as a rule of *life* to him.”—(“The Sabbath, the Law, and the Ministry,” p. 10.) This statement evinces a lamentable want either of perspicacity or of fairness. The law is here put forward by Mr. Mackintosh as the procuring cause of life, whereas he knows that no Christian holds such a sentiment. The Christian holds that the law is a rule for the guidance of his life and conduct ; but he does not hold that he is able to obtain life, or salvation, or justification by it. These two things are as distinct as the poles. It is one thing to be placed under the law to procure life by it, and quite a different thing to be placed under it as a rule for our guidance as to

character and conduct. The man who cannot see this distinction should not attempt to write ; and the man who sees it and intentionally shuffles it, should not be believed on any subject.

“The law,” continues Mr. Mackintosh, “is not the rule of the believer’s life Christ is our rule of life.” Where does he learn this? How is Christ a rule? We are said to be “under the law to Christ ;” but if Mr. Mackintosh were correct, it should have been stated that we are “under Christ,” instead of being “under the law to Christ.” If Mr. M. had power of discrimination, he would see that Christ is not a law, but an example. And why is He an example? Just because He has rendered perfect obedience to the law. A law and an example are two very different things. The man who renders complete obedience to the laws of England may be a good example for us to follow, but he never can become the law of England. So is it with Christ. He has rendered perfect obedience to the law, and therefore is a perfect example which we should imitate ; but in the very nature of things, He cannot become a law ; and we are nowhere told that He has released us from the obligations of the moral law as a rule to guide our conduct. We are “not without law to God, but under the law to Christ.”

VARIATIONS OF PLYMOUTHISM.

THERE is such a variety of opinion on different points amongst the members of the sect which is commonly known by the title of Plymouth Brethren, that I could not undertake to enumerate all their peculiarities. For practical purposes, however, the sect may be divided into three great heads,—the Müllerites, the Newtonites, and the Darbyites. These three parties differ most materially on fundamental points ; and as I have been charged with misrepresenting some of them, in consequence of not having pointed out the distinctions between them, I must now refer to the matter.

In the month of June 1862, I received a letter from Mr. Maunsell, who, I believe, belongs to the Müllerite division, complaining that I had misrepresented the views of his party. As I wish to give every man full fair-play, I will just let him speak for himself. “I have no sympathy,” says he, “with Mr. Darby’s peculiar tenets, ecclesiastical, doctrinal, or prophetic. I could give you many grave errors of his you have not touched upon, which I greatly abhor, and so do the portion of the division on the contrary side of his. . . . I can say for myself, and for those with whom I associate, that we have not, and never had, the doctrines you con-

demn in him and in his party. . . . I have no objection to make to your letters, as far as Messrs Darby, Stanley, and Mackintosh were concerned ; but I was anxious that you should know that, about twelve years ago, there was a division amongst the Brethren called Plymouth." Justice demands that I should thus allow Mr. Maunsell to speak for himself. I may further state, that I fully believe what Mr. Maunsell says on his own behalf. How far all the Müllerites, however, may go with him, is another question. I do not pretend to say much on the subject, because I have not read many of their writings. But I confess there is one passage in "The Letter of the Ten" (this letter is signed by Mr. Müller, Mr. Craik, and eight others) which rouses my suspicions as to their orthodoxy. "We feel it of the deepest importance," say they, "explicitly to state that the views relative to the person of our blessed Lord, held by those who, for sixteen years, have been occupied in teaching the Word amongst you, are unchanged. The truth relative to the divinity of His person, the sinlessness of His nature, and the perfection of His sacrifice, which have been taught both in public teaching and in writing for these many years past, are those which we still maintain." Now, what do they mean by "the person" of our Lord? It could not be the Godhead, because this was never doubted by Mr. Newton, whose opinions they were called on to try. Mr. Newton was

charged with giving Christ a *sinful humanity*, but he was never charged with disputing the Godhead of Christ. It was the humanity alone, then, "The Ten" had to deal with. Hence I conclude, when they speak of the person of Christ, they mean His humanity, and not His Godhead. In order to remove any impression about their sympathising with the views ascribed to Mr. Newton regarding Christ's humanity, they say they believe in the divinity of His person, the sinlessness of His nature, and the perfection of His sacrifice. As the Godhead is not called in question, and as they are declaring their own views regarding the point on which Mr. Newton has been charged with heresy—the humanity of Christ—all they say here applies to the humanity. Otherwise, their observations would be foreign to the subject. If I am correct in this, they are thoroughly involved in the "heavenly humanity" theory, when they say they believe in "the divinity of Christ's person." Some parties may, perhaps, say that "The Ten" did not mean what they affirm—that they were only carried away by the "*slang*" of the Darbyite school, without considering the true import of their language; but I cannot adopt that explanation, simply because we have no right to imagine that they did not understand what they were saying. As they are men of education and leaders of the people, they ought to get credit for knowing the thing whereof they affirm. I, therefore, take their language as I

find it, and charge them with the fair meaning of their own statements.

The above paragraph has given great offence to Mr. Craik and his party. As it is always my wish to give the strictest fair-play to every man, I shall allow Mr. Craik to speak for himself. In a letter which I received from him in March 1863, he says, "You evidently were not aware, when you wrote that paragraph, that Socinianism was one of the charges brought against Mr. Newton. . . . I do most solemnly assert that your interpretation of the expression referred to is one which never even entered into my mind, nor, do I believe, into the mind of any of my fellow-labourers. . . . I think it right to suggest that you ought either to have made yourself acquainted with the views which are held and taught amongst us, or to leave our views alone." In this last sentence, Mr. Craik evidently means that I should have travelled beyond the letter of "The Ten," and read their different writings, before forming my opinion of the meaning of the letter of "The Ten." Now, this appears to me a most extraordinary proposition for any sane man to make. We here find ten men of position and high education sitting down to write a deliberate deliverance of their opinion on one of the most momentous subjects which could engage their attention. Could there be any place so appropriate for finding their exact opinion of this point as in this

very letter? Certainly not; and yet one of the chief men amongst them suggests that, in place of judging their views on this special point from this deliberate document, I should have gone elsewhere to find out what they meant. Was anything so absurd ever heard of? Never. As Mr. Craik has here emphatically asserted that he never intended the expression animadverted on to convey the meaning I have taken out of it, I frankly and unreservedly accept his declaration as true, both on his own part and on the part of his friends. At the same time, I must express my regret that he and his fellow-labourers did not state their opinions on this momentous subject in language that would have been above all suspicion; and that did not require a person to read their other works to find out what they meant. They should have been far more careful than they were. But I believe the plain state of the matter is, they were in a sort of go-between position, trying to avoid both sides, and then, as might have been expected under such time-serving circumstances, their deliverance did not ring out that unmistakable sound which it should have done. As they say themselves, "We did not feel it well to be considered as identifying ourselves with either party." It would have been well, however, if they had written so plainly that every person would have known what they meant.

In his letter to me, Mr. Craik says, "If you had

given your views to the world on any subject, would you think it right that a single doubtful expression should be made the subject of a serious charge?" I have no difficulty whatever in answering Mr. Craik's question. If I had published a direct and deliberate opinion on any subject, and afterwards, in some casual, indirect, and unintentional way, had dropped some doubtful expression on the same point, I would certainly consider it only fair that the doubtful expression should be interpreted in accordance with the deliberate opinion. No doubt of this. But this is in no sense the case of "The Ten," because, in place of being incidental, casual, or unintentional, it would be impossible to imagine anything more serious, deliberate, and intentional, than a letter written by ten men for the express purpose of stating their opinions concerning certain charges brought against them. If this letter be not deliberate, I know not what is. No man who signed it should complain of the interpretation put on its ambiguous parts; but he should censure himself most severely for having made any of it ambiguous; and especially for having used the least shuffling respecting such a momentous question as the divinity or humanity of Christ.

Mr. Craik says, "By the 'divinity of His person' we meant neither more nor less than would be understood by the other phrase, 'Godhead of Christ.' The notion of a '*heavenly humanity*,' so far as I know, was not at that time held or taught by anybody." The

statements on this point are so contradictory that it is difficult for one, who was not on the spot at the time the divisions took place, to come to a right conclusion. Mr. Craik here leads us to believe that the doctrine of the "heavenly humanity" was not held or taught by anybody at the time the letter of "The Ten" was written—that is, at the time the discussions and divisions took place concerning Mr. Newton's doctrines in 1847 (see "Bethesda," by W. Trotter, page 4); whereas Dr. Tregelles, in his published "Letter," dated Plymouth, March 15, 1849, which purports to give a faithful account of these divisions in 1845, 1846, and 1847, states as follows:—"I will give a few instances—expressions which *I know* to have been used. It was said that 'the Lord was *man*, but not the son of Adam;' and that the name, *Son of man*, was simply a title; that 'His humanity was *something divine*;' that 'it was a *spiritual humanity*;' that 'He was not a man of the substance of His mother, but that He was of the substance of God, His Father;' that 'the expression, without father, without mother, without descent, related to our Lord as man; and that the genealogies both in Matthew and Luke were those of Joseph, His reputed father, and not of Mary; so that the Scripture has designedly cut Him off from the family of man, and from that of Israel.'" It is not easy to reconcile Mr. Craik with Dr. Tregelles on this point, as they directly contradict

each other ; but I believe Dr. Tregelles to be entirely in the right.

There is one statement in Mr. Craik's letter which has placed me in a condition of utter amazement. I had argued that the expression in the letter of "The Ten" must have applied to the humanity of Christ, because the question of His Godhead was not in debate ; and I stated that Mr. Newton, though charged with giving Christ a sinful humanity, was never charged with denying His Godhead. To meet and overturn this essentially important point in the clearing of "The Ten," Mr. Craik says, "it is entirely contrary to the fact to assert that Mr. Newton was not accused of Socinianism." If Mr. Craik be not speaking after a thoroughly jesuitical fashion, the term Socinianism here must be meant to apply to a denial of the Godhead of Christ, and not to any special views of the humanity, because on any other supposition his statement would be no reply whatever to my assertion, that Mr. Newton "was never charged with disputing the Godhead of Christ." This accusation against Mr. Newton is certainly new light to me ; but I confess I cannot believe it. He may have been charged with holding views somewhat allied to Socinianism in regard to Christ's humanity ; but that he was charged with joining Socinus in denying His Godhead, is a thing which I am not prepared to accept, notwithstanding Mr. Craik's assertion on the subject. I have

not read many of the writings of the Müllerites, but I have read more of the publications of the Darbyite enemies of Mr. Newton than I would like to read again, and I have never yet observed one sentence which struck me as charging Mr. Newton with denying the Godhead of Christ. It is hardly credible to suppose that the charges on this head could have been made without being put prominently forward in their different publications. Take, for example, Mr. Trotter's tract called "Bethesda." "First," says he, "the circumstances which gave occasion for 'The Letter of the Ten.' In 1847, a doctrine was found to be promulgated by Mr. Newton, by which our blessed Lord Jesus Christ was represented as exposed, *because of his relation to Adam*, to that sentence of death that had been pronounced on the whole family of man. He was represented as exposed to that curse and to the doom of man. It was taught that, *in consequence of Christ's relation to Adam*, His own relation, *as a man*, to God, was such that, for the first thirty years of His life, the hand of God was stretched out rebuking Him in anger and chastening Him in hot displeasure." Not a word here about the Godhead. It is all about the humanity. However objectionable the doctrines stated may be, they have no relation to the Godhead. They are specifically limited to the humanity of Christ. Nay, more ; there is no mention of this charge concerning the Godhead in the letter of "The Ten,"

but rather the opposite. "In conclusion," say "The Ten," "we would seek to impress upon all present the evil of treating the subject of our Lord's humanity as a matter of speculative or angry controversy." This does not look very like a charge concerning the Godhead; it is specially on the humanity. I do not now assert that this charge respecting the Godhead was never preferred, because it might have been without my knowledge; but I must say, I am not prepared to accept it without further evidence than I at present possess. I strongly suspect that Mr. Craik, in his anxiety to save "The Ten," has been maligning Mr. Newton.

If the reader turns back to the 153d page of this work, he will find a highly important quotation from Mr. Trotter's tract called "Bethesda." On the supposition that Mr. Trotter is worthy of credit, it must be granted that Mr. Newton has promulgated some dreadful opinions. Whether Mr. Trotter's statements, however, are correct or not, is not of the slightest personal concern to me, as I am in no way responsible for them. Seeing they are in print, I am responsible only to quote them fairly. But if they are not strictly correct, Mr. Trotter's position is a most serious one. It is not in my power to decide the question, but in justice to Mr. Newton and myself, I must clear it up as far as I now know the true state of the facts.

On the 21st of June 1862, Mr. Newton wrote me a note, in which he says, "I am not surprised at the misapprehension that has led you to say what you have respecting me, at the close of your tract; for my sentiments have been by some persons so industriously misrepresented, that it would be wonderful, indeed, if many were not deceived. If, however, you will have the kindness to glance at the publications I now send, you will see in a moment that my doctrines are the very reverse of those imputed to me." I was greatly surprised when I read this note, because I never imagined, after reading Mr. Trotter's tract, that there could be the slightest doubt of Mr. Newton's heterodoxy. I therefore read the works he sent me with intense interest and great care. And I am free to confess that *these* works, so far from bearing out Mr. Trotter's explicit statement that Mr. Newton considered the sufferings of Christ's life "*non-substitutional*," taught the very reverse, and that, too, in the most unmistakable language. I might adduce many proofs, but one will suffice. "All His sufferings," says Mr. Newton, "were to that end, and none ever came on Him, from the cradle to the grave, but as the Redeemer. . . . He was ever acting as the surety of God's people, and, therefore, whatever sufferings He might endure under the righteous government of God, they came on Him as one who was suffering all that He did suffer for

the sake of others, as their appointed Redeemer and Sacrifice. His own personal holiness and excellency were not affected thereby.”—(“Our Suffering Surety,” pp. 5, 6.) There can be no mistake about his views here. Indeed I must say that Mr. Newton puts forward his opinions in the most intelligible manner. A person may disagree with him, and may consider his opinions inconsistent with each other, but there is hardly a possibility of misunderstanding him. Consequently I was surprised at the following statement in the letter of “The Ten” :—“The tracts some of us knew to be written in such an ambiguous style that we greatly shrunk from the responsibility of giving any formal judgment on the matter. . . . Many would not be able to understand what the tracts contain, because of the mode of expression employed.” This is not the case with any of those I have read. Mr. Newton does not leave one in doubt as to the opinion he holds. In this respect, his works contrast most favourably with the ambiguous, double-dealing, jesuitical writings of some of his opponents.

Having arrived at this stage of the proceedings, I felt uncomfortable about the circulation of my pamphlet. I knew I was not to blame, because I had not misrepresented a single item of what was stated by Mr. Trotter, nor had I in the least exceeded his statement. But still I felt a reluctance to circulate a single word about the absolute truth

of which I had reasonable doubt. What, then, was I to do? I had at that time between two and three thousand copies of my pamphlet unsold. On mature consideration, I made up my mind to lose and destroy them all, and issue a new edition, in order to set Mr. Newton straight with the public, *provided* he would prove to me that Mr. Trotter had falsified his printed statements. Without this proof I could not proceed one step, because I would not otherwise be justified in throwing a slur on Mr. Trotter's character. There was no possibility, that I could see, of reconciling Mr. Trotter's and Mr. Newton's statements. They could not both be correct; but which of them was right I was not in a position to decide. On one point—the point of substitution—Mr. Trotter's statement was at direct variance with all I had read of Mr. Newton's. But then I felt I could not fairly judge Mr. Trotter, because Mr. Newton had not sent me the pamphlet from which Mr. Trotter professed to quote. I therefore came to the determination that, unless I saw this pamphlet with my own eyes, I would not withdraw one word I had quoted from Mr. Trotter. If I were to do so, I would be doing Mr. Trotter a great injustice, by impugning his veracity. If Mr. Trotter has made his quotations fairly from Mr. Newton's pamphlet, he has a right to be upheld and supported, no matter how inconsistent those statements may be with other writings of Mr. Newton's.

I would judge the matter at issue by the pamphlet, and the pamphlet alone.

Impressed with these views, I wrote, on the 21st July 1862, to Mr. Newton, as follows :—" However far I may differ from the views contained in the books you sent me, I must say I am much pleased with the honest, intelligible, and straightforward manner in which your views are set forth. I will be much obliged if you send me the tracts you have withdrawn from circulation, and from which Mr. Trotter has quoted on the 4th and 5th pages of 'Bethesda.' If I find, as I expect, that he has misrepresented you, I will go to the expense of getting out another edition of my pamphlet, in order that you may be set right as far as I am concerned." No person could reasonably expect me to go farther than this. Indeed, I was not necessitated to go thus far, as Mr. Newton and Mr. Trotter had a right to settle their own dispute. However, as Mr. Newton's note to me conveyed so decidedly the impression that he had been grossly misrepresented, I felt anxious to have the case placed fairly before the world. Now, it appeared to me there was only one way in which this could be properly done ; and that was by allowing it to be shown, by an examination of the pamphlet itself, that Mr. Trotter had dealt unfairly in his quotations, and had misrepresented the views of the writer. This was a simple affair, and one easily settled. The pamphlet would speak for itself. Be-

sides, it appeared most fortunate that the document should be examined by a person who was opposed to both parties. My surprise, then, was great when I received a letter from Mr. Newton declining to send me the tracts. He said he could not do so, as he had only one copy of them himself, and it was important that he should keep them for reference ; but if I happened to be in London, he would be glad to let me have a sight of them. He also said, as his reputation was already injured as much as it could be, he would not wish me to do what I proposed about my own pamphlet. Mr. Newton is fully capable of thinking for himself ; but he has not adopted the plan I would have taken under similar circumstances. If I thought I had been misquoted and misrepresented, I would be very sorry to allow any man to blacken my character. I would soon expose his dishonesty by republishing every line of the work upon which he founded his statements. This would give all parties fair play, and let the public judge for themselves. Mr. Newton appears to me to labour under one great mistake. He seems to think that the public ought to be satisfied Mr. Trotter has misrepresented him, because the sentiments Mr. Trotter attributes to him are inconsistent with plain statements in several of his works. In this view, I believe, he is entirely mistaken. It matters not what his other works may say ; I would not clear him of a single charge Mr. Trotter has brought against

him, provided those charges can be fairly, fully, and plainly substantiated from the publications from which Mr. Trotter professes to quote. The inconsistencies of an author's statements are no proof that such statements never were uttered. If Mr. Newton is to be cleared of Mr. Trotter's charges, it must be done by showing that Mr. Trotter has falsified or garbled his quotations, or put a construction on the words which the language is not fairly able to bear. There is no other way in which the thing could be done; and, therefore, as Mr. Newton has not placed his tracts before me, I feel compelled to allow Mr. Trotter and Mr. Newton to speak for themselves, and I leave the public to draw their own conclusions. I have transferred Mr. Trotter's statements to this edition of my work, because, if I were to expunge them, I would be judging the matter without sufficient evidence from the original documents, and I would thus very improperly cast a slur on Mr. Trotter's moral reputation. In the present state of my documentary information, I must leave the matter thus. As Mr. Trotter's and Mr. Newton's statements are contradictory, they cannot both be correct, but I would not be justified in undertaking to decide between them, unless I saw the documents on which the statements are grounded.

Let this dispute be settled as it may, one thing is certain,—the existence of such contradictory statements, and of such opposite opinions on vital points,

is an indisputable proof that the assumptions of the Darbyites about their own inspiration and the presidency of the Spirit, have no foundation in truth. "The failure," says Dr. Tregelles, "of those who *profess to act* on certain principles does not condemn the *principles* themselves ; otherwise, what shall we say of the churches planted by the apostles of Christ, which so soon departed from the truth of God both in doctrine and practice ?"—("Three Letters," p. 3.) As I believe Dr. Tregelles does not agree with the Darbyite inspirations, and as I imagine his observations are intended to apply under ordinary circumstances, I at once accede to the truth of his statement. The case he adduces is one in point, and answers my purpose at the present moment. The apostles, *because they were inspired*, delivered infallible instructions, both on doctrine and practice, to the churches ; but the churches, *because they contained uninspired men*, went aside from the instructions delivered by the inspired apostles. The errors of the churches did not affect the correctness of the inspired instructions they had received, but they conclusively proved that the parties who committed the errors were not acting under direct inspiration. So is it with the Plymouthites. When they contradict each other on vital points, it is a certain indication that they are not acting under the direct *movements* of the Holy Spirit, and that the Holy Spirit is not presiding. False doctrines and erroneous

practices could never arise under the presidency of the Spirit of God.

Such was the state of matters regarding Mr. Newton's case at the time a previous edition of this work was printed. Still I could not feel satisfied with the condition of affairs. There was something mysterious which I could not get under. If Mr. Newton had changed his views at the time he withdrew the obnoxious pamphlets from circulation, it would have been very easy for him to have announced the change in unmistakable language, and then the whole dispute would have been over. In place of doing this, however, he charges his opponents with industriously misrepresenting his views. It thus becomes a question of misrepresentation of facts, and not a change of opinions. Mr. Newton might have settled this as easily as possible by reprinting his tracts. He was fairly bound either to stand by them or to acknowledge that they were wrong. He has not, strictly speaking, done either. In place of standing up for his published opinions, he withdrew the tracts from circulation; and instead of acknowledging error and a complete change of opinion, he charges his opponents with misrepresenting the views contained in his tracts. This conduct seemed to me so extraordinary that I was anxious to get a sight of the pamphlets. I have now had an opportunity, though not from Mr. Newton, of perusing the documents, and, in justice to Mr. Trotter and all parties

concerned, I feel it to be my duty to examine the question at issue. If I were to shrink from this subject at present, I would not be dealing fairly by Mr. Trotter after the reference I made to him in a former edition of this work. It is a very disagreeable thing to quote from tracts which have been withdrawn from circulation; but I feel it to be unavoidable just now, seeing that my previous publication has placed me in a position between the two parties,—and that position unfavourable to Mr. Trotter.

In his “Remarks on the Sufferings of the Lord Jesus,” written at Plymouth, July 26th, 1847, and published in London in 1847, Mr. Newton says, “But in the Psalms, where we specially read the inward experiences of His spirit, we find not only the sufferings of those hours of public ministry—not only the sufferings and reproach that pertained to Him as the appointed servant of God, but sufferings also which pertained to Him, *because He was a man, and because He was an Israelite*;—sufferings, *therefore*, which cannot be *restricted* to the years of His public service, but which must be extended over the whole of that period during which He was sensible, under the hand of God, of the condition into which man had sunk, and yet more into which Israel had sunk in His sight” (pp. 1, 2). Now, it appears to me that there is no room for misunderstanding here. It would be difficult to make the language much more explicit than it is; and

if it be not heretical, I know not what would constitute heresy. The sufferings of Christ are most pointedly and carefully divided into two classes ;—those which He endured “as the appointed servant of God ;” and those “which pertained to Him because He was a man, and because He was an Israelite ;—sufferings, therefore, which cannot be restricted to the years of His public service.” A most emphatic distinction is here made between His public and private position. He is not only represented as suffering in His capacity as the appointed servant of God ; but He is also specially stated to have suffered “under the hand of God” as a man and an Israelite, and that in the way which made Him sensible of the condition into which man had sunk. If He suffered under the hand of God as a man, and that in such a sense as to exclude His position as the appointed servant of God, it is indisputably manifest that this portion of His sufferings was “non-substitutional.” Nay, more, such sufferings would inevitably make Him a sinner ;—otherwise the sufferings we endure in life are not the result of sin. Under such circumstances, Christ was not fit to be a Saviour. The only consistent view which can be held is, that Jesus, in everything which He either did or suffered from the cradle to the grave, was standing, in the strictest sense, in the position of the appointed servant of God, who was to obey and suffer in the room and stead of His people. It was on account of His chosen ones that

everything occurred, and not by the mere accident of His birth as a man and an Israelite.

“Personally,” continues Mr. Newton, “He was one who, as to His essential relation to God, could know no change. . . . But what were the new relations assumed, when He was made flesh, born of a woman, made under the law, and were they relations that necessarily brought suffering with them? Surely we cannot hesitate as to the reply. . . . Creation groaned in the bondage of corruption. That groan was a penalty—an infliction from the hand of God, intended to work on the human soul certain results of sorrow. The Lord Jesus experienced those results. It had been said to Adam, ‘Cursed is the ground for thy sake.’ Labour, sorrow, sweat of the brow (and many other things might be added), were not circumstances fortuitously connected with the human family—they were *infiictions in displeasure* from the hand of God, and under these inflections because He was a man, Jesus was found. But He had not merely become connected with the sorrows and sufferings of *man*. There was a part of the human family that had been brought into peculiar nearness to God, who had nourished and brought them up as children, but they had rebelled against Him. This was Israel. . . . They had fallen from that ground of professed obedience, and like Adam had earned, by their disobedience, the fearful inflections of God’s broken law. Such was the condition of Israel when

Jesus came amongst them. . . . Lest I should be misunderstood because I say Jesus, like the prophets who had gone before, was exposed to inflictions from the hand of God, I beg that it may be remembered that personally He was free from every taint, though dwelling as it were in the midst of lepers. . . . These sufferings of His life, quite as much as those of His death, only reached Him because of the relative position which it pleased Him to assume in respect of Israel, and of man. They reached His person through and because of others. . . . Surely the same reasons that would lead us to admit that He suffered under certain inflictions which the hand of God had laid on man as man, would go far to show that if there were any analogous inflictions on Israel, He would be exposed to those inflictions as well. Was, then, the Lord Jesus subjected during His life to *all* the inflictions that were due to man as man, and to Israel as Israel? I answer, No! To be obnoxious, that is, exposed to certain things, is a different thing from actually enduring them. His faith, His prayers, His obedience, all contributed to preserve Him from many things to which He was by His relative position exposed, and by which He was threatened. . . . On the cross He endured wrath—infinite wrath, not wrath in chastisement, but wrath in vengeance; and during such a season all interferences of the Father on His behalf must necessarily be withdrawn; but during all the chastenings of His

previous pilgrimage this was not so. He was continually refreshed, strengthened, sustained, and angels sent to comfort Him. So different is the place of a substitute *for* sinners, from the place of suffering *amongst* sinners" (pp. 4-11). Although these extracts are easily enough understood, they are quite contradictory to each other. Mr. Newton admits that in "His relation to God, Jesus could know no change," and that He "was personally free from every taint;" but the whole line of his argument is a contradiction to this view. His assertion that Jesus is free from taint will not keep Him clear of it, when he places Him in a position which involves it. We must not forget that he has already divided the sufferings of Christ into two classes,—those of the appointed servant, and those of the man. This is a fundamental distinction. Under such a division, those which He endured as the servant must have been as the representative of His people; but this representative position is excluded by Mr. Newton's division, which subjects Him to suffering in His capacity merely as a man and an Israelite. Keeping Mr. Newton's distinction in mind, there is something awful in the statement that Jesus, "because He was a man," suffered "inflictions in displeasure from the hand of God," and that He was under the curse pronounced against the ground for Adam's sake; and that He was obnoxious to, and threatened by, many things, *from which He was preserved only by His*

prayers, His faith, and His obedience! It is no relief to Mr. Newton's position to tell us, as he does, that Jesus suffered only on account of the relative position He assumed in regard to man and to Israel, and that the sufferings reached Him through and because of others, for this simple reason, that Mr. Newton does not mean the position of a substitute by these terms. *Through* others and *because* of others is very far from being the same thing as *in place* of others and *for* others. Indeed, Mr. Newton makes this point plain enough himself when he draws his own distinction between the sufferings of Christ on the cross and "all the chastenings of His previous pilgrimage," and says, "so different is the place of a substitute *for* sinners—from the place of suffering *amongst* sinners." It was not in His capacity of the Appointed Servant that He endured these life sufferings, but merely on account of the fact that He was "dwelling in the midst of lepers." On this view of the case, the sufferings of His life, previous to the cross, were not connected with His people, as their representative, but only occurred because He happened by His birth to be placed *amongst* sinners, — the sufferings reached Him "through others and because of others" in whose midst He was placed, and not because He was their representative and stood in their stead. This is the inevitable doctrine promulgated in the tract from which I have quoted.

The view I have already taken of Mr. Newton's opinions is fully sustained by his further observations. "Since, then," he continues, "it is admitted that He was chastened ; and we all acknowledge that He was not chastened because of personal sin, for He was perfect:—and since He was not until the cross punished substitutionally, why was He chastened at all? How could it be but because He was made experimentally to prove the reality of that condition into which others, but more especially Israel, had sunk themselves, by their disobedience to God's holy law, a condition out of which He was able to extricate Himself, and from which He proved that He could extricate Himself by His own perfect obedience. . . . The manner in which the Lord Jesus experienced outwardly sufferings that immediately flowed from the curse that was resting upon Israel, can only be gathered from an examination of the passages in the Psalms and elsewhere, which refer to this subject. . . . Observe, I do not say that Jesus was personally accursed, because He formed part of the people on whom curses were resting. Suppose a servant of God were to go voluntarily, and dwell with the people of a wicked and abandoned island ; and suppose inflictions from God—such as drought or famine—were sent upon that people, the servant of God would not be personally accursed because he suffered or pined under those calamities. It would

reach him as an innocent person who suffered because of others : yet in consequence of his position, he would be obnoxious, that is, exposed to all the inflictions that the hand of God might be directing against that evil generation" (pp. 11, 12). Notwithstanding all Mr. Newton has said here about the sinless perfection of Christ and His personal freedom from curse, the doctrine contained in the paragraph is most objectionable. It entirely excludes Christ's position as the representative of His people, and makes Him, by the mere fact of His birth as a man and an Israelite, to be chastened by God, and to experimentally feel the reality of the condition into which others had sunk themselves by disobedience to God's law, and to feel this in such a way that He required to extricate Himself out of it by obedience ; and it also states that He experienced the sufferings which flowed from the curse that was resting on Israel ;—all this, be it observed, not as His people's representative, but by the mere condition of His birth as a man and an Israelite. Surely this is most deplorable doctrine ! How any man could trust his salvation to a Saviour who required to extricate Himself from a cursed position, like the one described, is a mystery to me. Mr. Newton's illustration from the "servant of God in the abandoned island," shows that he did not consider Christ as standing, whilst bearing these chastisements or sufferings, in

the room and stead of His people in any sense, but only as exposed and liable to such things because of the mere accident of His birth as a man and an Israelite, in the same way as the servant in the abandoned island suffered from the mere fact of his dropping into the island, and not as the representative of the people in that island. He was suffering in the midst of others, but not for others. This is a very different position from the one which recognises Christ, in every particular from the cradle to the grave, as the representative of His people in such a sense that everything He did, and everything which happened to Him, was in some special point of view in the room and stead of His people.

In his second pamphlet, called "Observations on a Tract, entitled 'The Sufferings of Christ,' dated September 1st, 1847, and published in 1847," Mr. Newton says in regard to Christ, "He was exposed, for example, because of His relation to Adam, to that sentence of death that had been pronounced on the whole family of man. Relatively, He was exposed to that curse ;—personally, He evinced His title to freedom from it, and His title to life by keeping that law of which it has been said, 'This do and thou shalt live.' . . . They came on Him because of His connection with others" (p. 9). The same doctrine is here as in the previous pamphlet. He does not recognise Jesus as the representative of His

people, doing and suffering everything, in some sense or other, on their behalf and for their benefit, but only by being accidentally, as it were, exposed to these things in consequence of His relation to Adam by birth as a man : relatively, that is, by birth as a man of Adam's race, He is represented as exposed to the curse of death, although personally He could escape from it by keeping the law: He suffered in connection with others, that is, along with them, but not as their representative,—exactly in the same way as the man on the abandoned island, who, in place of suffering for the benefit of the inhabitants, suffered merely because of the unfortunate position in which he had been placed amongst them, or in relation to them. This is miserable doctrine !

At pages 22, 23, 24, and 25, Mr. Newton argues that Christ during life, not on the cross and not as the substitute of His people, was suffering from the hand of God, and in this sense quotes and applies the passage, "Because of Thine indignation and Thy wrath," and continues, "we agree in saying that they [the sufferings of Christ] were not substitutional, neither were they because of personal sin : if, therefore, they existed at all, and the Scripture I have quoted proves that they did exist, it must have been because of association or connection with others. [By association with others, but not as the representative of others.] And are not the Scriptures full

of the history of such sufferings? . . . He drank the cup of sorrow which association with Israel brought. . . . The Book of Lamentations teaches us, perhaps more distinctly than any other, how deeply He drank of this cup. The sudden transition in the descriptions of that book from the nation to an individual, shows how close His association with their ruin was individualised, as it were, in the misery and the rebuke of Israel, 'See, O Lord, and consider, for *I* am become vile. Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? Behold, and see if there be any sorrow like unto My sorrow which is done unto Me, wherewith the Lord hath afflicted Me in the day of His fierce anger.' *Penalties*, therefore, of the Fall were connected even with the constitution of His human nature. Here was the early proof that He was under affliction from the hand of God. . . . I entirely admit that God was able to have protected Jesus either partially or completely from the influence of these things. He might have placed Him in the very presence of the burning flame, and preserved Him unscathed. There was no essential necessity for His being made to suffer until He took the strictly vicarious place: and this, I believe, is the reason why, during His early childhood, He grew up unscathed" (p. 34). It is here set forth that Jesus, because of His birth as a man,—because of His mere association with others,—and not as in any sense the representative of His people, is made to

suffer indignation and wrath from the hand of God ; to drink the cup of sorrow which association with Israel brought ; to be made vile ; to bear unparalleled sorrow in the days of the Lord's fierce anger : and that the penalties of the Fall were connected with the very constitution of His human nature. The doctrine here contained is so dreadful to contemplate that I do not like to dwell upon it. The argument would result in making Jesus one of the vilest of sinners. It even goes the length of assuming that, owing to His natural liability to suffering and to death, the miraculous interference of God was required to preserve Him unscathed through childhood. All this, be it observed, not as the representative of His people, but owing to His mere association with others,—owing to the mere accident of His birth as a man and an Israelite.

I think it is not necessary to go any further with this subject. What has been produced is quite sufficient to demonstrate the pernicious nature of the doctrines which have been promulgated by Mr. Newton. It does not appear to me that there can be any difficulty in understanding his position, nor yet in divining the serious consequences resulting from that position. I am sorry to say that a perusal of the third tract, called "A Letter on Subjects connected with the Lord's Humanity," has led me to fear very much that Mr. Newton has not changed a single one of those opinions which he enunciated in the other two,

although he has withdrawn them from circulation. I shall now leave this subject, and turn to his views regarding the innate mortality of Christ's humanity.

"The Lord Jesus," says Mr. Newton, "was fore-ordained as the sacrifice before all worlds, and, therefore, it was impossible for Him to die except as the sacrifice ; but with the very object of dying as the sacrifice, He was pleased voluntarily to assume a body which, *as regarded its natural or physical condition*, was as much exposed to death, if smitten by the sword, or deprived of necessary nutriment, as ours would be. Yet it was as impossible for Christ to die in consequence of anything to which He might be thus exposed, as for God to be plucked from the throne of His government. If all nutriment had been withdrawn from Him from His birth, yet God His Father would have sustained Him by *perpetual miracle*, or He would have so sustained Himself, rather than that death should have fallen in any way, except substitutionally, on the One who deserved only blessing and life."— ("Letter on the Lord's Humanity," 1848, p. 20 ; footnote). Again, Mr. Newton asks, "Does Mr. C. really think that Christ had an immortal body ? Had He a body which inherently possessed a capacity of not dying, even in the case of all nutriment being withheld, and no miracle being wrought to sustain it ? . . . In that case, indeed, the Lord would not have had a mortal body ; but how, then, could He have died even

on the cross—or how could He have been made like unto His brethren in all things, sin excepted ?”— (“Letter to a Friend,” p. 7.) Mr. Newton here lays down two points. First, as Christ’s death was foreordained to take place in the room of His people, He could not, in the providence of God, have died in any other than a substitutionary manner. This is all very well, and quite correct. But in the next place, he very explicitly lays it down, that the humanity of Christ was so constituted intrinsically that it must have died, if providentially permitted to come into circumstances which would have caused death to fallen humanity, unless life had been sustained by the miraculous interference of God. There cannot be the slightest doubt that Mr. Newton holds that Christ’s body was in its own essential nature mortal in such a manner that, if it had not been foreordained He was to die on the cross, and if no miracle had interfered to prevent death, He would have died in course of nature like an ordinary man. That this is his view is evident not only from what I have quoted, but it is also evident from the contrast he draws between Christ and the paradisaical condition of Adam. He says the body of Christ was by its natural or physical condition, apart from the foreordained arrangements of God, as liable to death as ours ; but in regard to Adam in Paradise he says, “Although capable of becoming mortal, yet he was not mortal.”—(“Suffering Surety,” p. 8.) He thus makes

Christ mortal, and Adam capable of becoming mortal. He considers if Christ had not been naturally mortal—if “this had not been the law of Christ’s humanity physically, He could not have died at all, except by a special miracle.”—(“Suffering Surety,” p. 11.)

I cannot possibly avoid looking upon this doctrine of Christ’s inherent mortality as a most decided heresy. It does not in the slightest degree affect my opinion that Charnock, Pearson, Bengel, and, perhaps, a few others, held the same views as Mr. Newton ; neither am I deterred by Dr. Tregelles’ statement in his letter to me, that “to hereticate teachers in the Church, whether living or dead,” for holding such an opinion, “is a very bold step ; for this sentence would include not some few such as Pearson and Bengel merely, but also orthodox teachers in general. This is not,” he continues, “even a point for discussion ; for it seems to be some Darbyite novelty that you have repeated.” I do not pretend to say how many, of what is called orthodox writers, may or may not have held the same views as those maintained by Mr. Newton and Dr. Tregelles ; but this I do know, that many of the quotations made from their writings do not by any means bear out the conclusions deduced from them ; because the views are not very specifically stated, nor do the writers appear to have had this special point before their minds at the time. On the contrary, I believe that the great body of

divines will be found on my side of the question. This, however, is not the view in which I wish to reason it, as it must be settled by Scripture, rather than by mere authority of man. Dr. Tregelles is quite astray in supposing I have derived my ideas from Darby. I held the same opinions as long as I remember,—certainly long before I heard of Darby,—and they were so firmly rooted in me, that I was quite horrified when I heard of the opposite, in this Plymouth controversy, as being held by Mr. Newton.

What saith the Scripture? “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. . . . For the wages of sin is death.” Is this true, or is it not? As I hold by Scripture, I maintain, from these plain and incontrovertible statements, that death is the consequence of sin, and that if there had never been sin, there would have been no death. There is no escape from this, if death be the wages of sin, and if death entered into the world by sin, and resulted from it. Consequently, if Christ’s body was naturally and intrinsically mortal, it must have been naturally and intrinsically sinful. In whatever aspect it was under mortality, in the same aspect it was under sin. Adam would never have died if he had not sinned; and Christ would never have died if He had not taken on Him the sins of His people. The fact that Christ died on the cross is a certain proof that He had the sins of

His people really, truly, and actually upon Him. There was no mockery in the matter. In His own nature, He was free from sin, and above mortality; but as the sinner's substitute, He had the sins of His chosen so really and truly upon Him, that he *became* mortal. They were so absolutely upon Him that, if He had not atoned for them, He could never have entered heaven. The imputation was real, and not that sham affair that some seem to imagine. He who personally knew no sin, had the sins of His people so thoroughly transferred to Him, that He was accounted by God as guilty of them all. As the Scripture informs us, He was "made sin" for us,—He was "made a curse for us,"—and it was by bearing the punishment due to our sins He died. His death is the strongest possible—an insuperable—argument for real imputation. It is a mistake to suppose Christ laid down His own life, in the way in which that is commonly understood. When it says He had power to lay it down, and power to take it again, it just means that He was in the strictest sense a voluntary agent. He had power to give His life, or not to give it, as He pleased. No man could force it from Him. He surrendered Himself to the cross of His own free will and accord. This is the only sense in which He laid down His own life. It cannot for a moment be imagined that He killed Himself, and thus committed suicide, which would have been the case if He had

taken away His own life on the cross. He died from suffering the punishment due to the sins of those for whom He was a substitute. His substitution was a real substitution. Our sins were really imputed to Him, and His righteousness is really imputed to us. It is a real, and not a mock, transaction.

Mr. Newton asks how, on the supposition of His not being naturally mortal, Christ could "have been made like unto His brethren, in all things, sin excepted"? It is very easy to answer this. The exception of the sin *includes* the exception of the mortality, because death is the wages of sin, and death entered into the world by sin. There is no mortality without sin. The expression, "In all things, sin excepted," is here tantamount to the expression, "In all things, death excepted." Christ was not mortal in His own nature, but He became mortal by taking the sins of His people on His own head. I am surprised that a man of Mr. Newton's perspicacity did not see that his argument militated against his own views,—that the exclusion of the sin proved the exclusion of the mortality.

That Christ's humanity was not innately mortal, is further established by His resurrection from the dead. In order to fulfil the Scripture, and also to prove the reality of His death, it was necessary for Him to lie a certain time in the grave; but when this set time was accomplished, the grave could not one moment longer retain Him. God raised Him up,

we are told, "because it was not possible that He should be holden of" death. Why was this not possible? If His body was naturally mortal, it was not only possible for Him to be holden of death, but it was actually impossible for Him to come out of the grave at that time, except by a special miracle. To say the least of it, without miraculous interference He must have gone into corruption, and remained in the dust till the general resurrection, if He went to the grave with a body naturally mortal. The body which is naturally mortal, naturally corrupts. Seeing, then, it was possible for Christ to die, why was it impossible for him to corrupt and remain dead? The answer is simple. Although not naturally mortal, His body was capable of becoming mortal. When He took the sins of His people on Him, He took mortality on Him. He was then "made sin for us;" He was then "made a curse for us;" He then became mortal. As the substitute of His chosen, however, He paid in death the full and entire penalty due for all their sins. He was then completely released from the consequences of the sins He had undertaken. The sins being atoned for and removed, He could not see corruption; the penalty being fully paid, He could not be holden of death. "I lay down my life," says He, "that I might take it again." When the sins of His people were on Him, He could die; but when they were

all removed, He could not see corruption, and the grave could not retain its holy occupant. Under sin, His flesh could see death; the sin being removed, His flesh could not see corruption, or remain in death. If His humanity had been naturally and intrinsically mortal, by right, and by all the laws of nature, it must have corrupted, and lain in the grave till the general resurrection. It was impossible, on this view, for it to escape from the one and the other by anything short of a direct miracle. Those surely have a very degraded view of Christ's humanity who can imagine that it was so constituted intrinsically that it required the performance of a miracle to save it from corruption, and to raise it from the dead. The very thought is dreadful, as it just places Him on a par with sinful mortals, who could all be raised in the same way. If, after the sins of His people were removed, His humanity had no natural and inherent right of escaping corruption and rising to immortality, it is evident there was no merit or value in His resurrection.

I think a great deal of the error existing on this subject has arisen from a misunderstanding of the double aspect of Christ's substitutionary work. He had to fulfil the law, as well as to suffer the penalty for its breach. He did both as the substitute of His people, and on their account; but He was not suffering the punishment whilst He was keeping the

law ; nor was He keeping the law whilst He was suffering the penalty for its breach. These two points are very distinct, and should never be confounded. So long as He was obeying the law, He had the Father's countenance ; but when He came under the penalty, and was made "sin for us," He was forsaken of God. It does not appear to be clearly revealed as to the exact period of His life when He commenced to do His "Father's business," nor yet as to the moment when He came under the punishment of sin ; and, therefore, it is presumptuous to pry into the matter, as many have done. We should stop where revelation stops. There is another point of some importance. Many parties seem to imagine that hunger, thirst, weariness, sleep, and such like, have arisen as the consequence of sin, and must of necessity demonstrate the natural mortality of those who are subject to them. This, however, is taking for granted the very thing which they require to prove. These parties seem to be wise beyond what is written. They forget that food was provided for Adam before ever he fell ; and that he was in a deep sleep when Eve was called into existence. To my thinking, it is impossible to tell precisely the different things to which Adam may have been liable in his unfallen condition, simply because revelation does not fully inform us on the point. We should therefore be

very careful of speculating on the subject. Whenever Scripture gives us light, let us receive it; but we should never call on our imaginations for the remainder. Those who ask questions regarding the effects of accidents, hunger, thirst, and fatigue on Christ's humanity, with a view to establish His innate mortality, would do well to ask themselves the same questions in regard to Adam in his unfallen condition. When they settle the point concerning Adam, they will be in a tolerably fair condition to deal with it in regard to Christ, but not till then. I am quite certain, however, that their principles of argument would land them inevitably in the position of making Adam intrinsically mortal, as he came from the hands of his Creator; and they would thus nullify the Scripture, which says that death entered into the world by sin, and that the wages of sin is death. On their view, death would be the necessary result of the nature of man, as God created him, and would in no sense bear any relation to sin, unless it was held that Adam, in place of being made in the image of God, came as a downright sinner from the hands of his Creator.

In contrasting our humanity with Christ's, Mr. Newton says: "He was not placed, in the same manner as we, under the necessity of death. We must die unless redemption intervene; He need not have died, even after He had placed Himself under

the necessary laws of mortality, because He could at any moment have reversed those laws, and necessity would have been no necessity to Him.”—(“Letter to a Friend,” p. 7.) I am surprised to find a man of Mr. Newton’s good sense penning such a sentence. If we must die because we are placed under the necessary laws of mortality, so must Christ, if He is placed under the necessary laws of mortality. There is not the slightest difference between the cases. Death is quite as certain in the one instance as in the other. By no means, says Mr. Newton. Why? Because Christ could at any moment use the power of His Godhead and reverse those laws, and save Himself. No doubt of this; but could He not as easily reverse those laws and save us? If so, where is the difference in the necessity of death? Nowhere. If the laws of nature can be reversed in the one case, they can surely be reversed in the other. If Christ could save Himself by almighty power, He could surely save us by the same power. If almighty power is required in each case, are they not both on a par? Who could point out the difference between them? The power which could have saved the humanity of Christ has already saved Enoch and Elijah, and will yet save those disciples who remain on the earth at the day of judgment. To be consistent with himself, Mr. Newton is bound to deny that Christ had the power to save man from death in the same way as He could have

saved His own humanity. Will he do this, and make his argument consistent with itself? I am certain he will not. It appears nothing short of dreadful, to my mind, to imagine that the humanity of Christ was of such a nature, that, apart from the cross, it must have died like one of ourselves and gone into corruption, unless a special miracle had been performed for its preservation. A humanity of this description is one which could not be depended on for the atonement of our sins.

The views I have been advocating are in no way incompatible with those Scriptures which speak of Christ being raised by the power of the Father. Christ says He laid down His life that He might take it again Himself. We are also told that He was raised by the power of the Father. There must be a sense in which these things are both perfectly true (and the Trinity in Unity will explain that sense); but it does not follow from this that the humanity was so inherently prone to corruption that God had to perform a miracle for its rescue. We can never make the humanity of Christ superior to, or independent of, the operations of Deity, for the simple reason that if we did so, we would make it God, and no humanity at all. Adam, even in his very highest condition, was subject to and dependent on the will of his Maker. God reigns through and over all His works. There is nothing created that is independent of Him or can

act without Him. But I cannot on this account imagine that it required the *miraculous* operation of Deity to raise the humanity of Christ, in the same way as it was put forth for the purpose of arresting the laws of decomposition and afterwards raising the body of Lazarus. There is a great difference between being raised by the power of God and being raised by the power of God put forth in a miraculous manner. As I have tried, however, to unfold the nature of this distinction in my "Letters on the Revival in Ireland," I need not dwell on it here. I have only further to remark that the argument which will make Christ's humanity mortal because it is subject to be raised by the power of God, will be equally fatal to the condition of His soul ; for we are told as emphatically that He would not leave His soul in hell, as we are that He would not suffer His body to see corruption. This most decidedly places the soul and the body in the same state of dependence upon God ; but it does not necessarily follow from this that either the one or the other was inherently liable to death and corruption. They were both subject to the operations of the Godhead ; but neither of them was intrinsically mortal.

In taking leave of Mr. Newton, I beg to assure him that my criticisms have not been dictated by a captious spirit. I felt bound in my conscience, as a matter of duty, to say what I have said. I would not willingly

say one word to hurt his feelings, if I could avoid it. On many points I differ from him ; in some instances, I believe his opinions are inconsistent with each other ; and on the question of the mortality of Christ's humanity, as well as regarding some of the sufferings of Christ, I hold his statements to be decidedly heretical. Notwithstanding all this, however, I am not by any means prepared to unchristianise him, as the Darbyites have done. On the contrary, I believe he is a most decided and devoted Christian who has unfortunately fallen into some gross errors. In my opinion, his heart, faith, and life are much better than some portions of his creed ; and I have no doubt he will yet shine as a bright star in the realms of glory.

I could not undertake even to enumerate the different heresies and errors which are held by the members of the Darbyite division of the Plymouth Brethren. Their name is legion. Dr. Tregelles says he was acquainted with the opinions of Marcion, Apelles, and Valentinus, of the second century, and with the Eutychian and Nestorian heresies, and that he found the parties who opposed his section at Plymouth "gave expression to almost every shade of thought, which in the same way opposes the full belief of Christians on these cardinal points. . . . I will give you," he continues, "a few instances—expressions which *I know* to have been used ; it was said that 'the Lord was *man* but not the

son of Adam,' and that the name 'Son of Man' was 'simply a title;' that 'His humanity was *something divine*,' that it was a '*spiritual humanity*;' that 'He did not become man *by birth*, but in some other way; that 'He was not man of the substance of His mother, but that He was of the substance of God, His Father; ' that 'the expression without father, without mother, without descent, related to our Lord as man, and that the genealogies both in Matthew and Luke were those of Joseph, His reputed father, and not of Mary; so that the Scripture has designedly cut Him off from *the family of man*, and from that of Israel.'"—("Three Letters," p. 16.)

In August 1862 I received a letter from a minister in England, from which I make the following extract:—
"Allow me to express to you the great pleasure I have had in the perusal of your pamphlet, and my deep conviction that you have laid the Church under great obligation by its timely appearance. . . . Allured by the appearance of their deep piety, I went among the Plymouth Brethren; and though I remained among them little more than six months, I saw quite enough. Among all the Christians I ever met, I never saw such intolerance and bigotry—such denial of the right of private judgment—and such miserable oppression, as among this sect. From *personal contact* with many of them, *I know* that the Plymouths do hold the errors you have so well exposed, and that the *real humanity*

of Christ, as believed in by the mass of Christians, is regarded by them, with horror, as a fearful heresy." I have received many important letters about my pamphlet and the views of the Darbyite Brethren ; but I consider this one peculiarly interesting and important, from the fact that the writer speaks from personal experience, as he was once in connection with the sect. He knows the opinions they really hold, but which they are not always honest enough to divulge. If they were thoroughly candid it would be easy to deal with them ; but their want of fairness is truly distressing. I have read on a considerable variety of subjects ; but it has never yet fallen to my lot to read any works which are so thoroughly insidious and so entirely jesuitical as the writings of some of the Plymouth fraternity.

The following letter will explain itself. Mr. Dorman held an important and prominent position as one of the leaders amongst the Plymouth Brethren for more than a quarter of a century. His eyes have at length been opened to "the chamber of horrors" connected with that most tyrannical and jesuitical sect ; and he has had the honesty and manliness to come straight out. His testimony is of overwhelming importance because his character stands beyond reproach, and also because he is thoroughly conversant with all the peculiarities of the system. His letter runs thus :—

“REIGATE, SURREY, *December 12, 1870.*

“DEAR DR. CARSON,—I feel that I have no title to obtrude myself upon your notice, or to take up your time, which has, doubtless, sufficient claims upon it; but I have just read your book on ‘The Plymouth Heresies,’ and on this account I venture to send you a line. In the first place, I may say that—if here and there I do not exactly agree with your statements—I think so highly of its force and purport that I heartily wish your book may gain all the attention from Christians that you can desire for it yourself. To me it possesses a melancholy interest which perhaps it could claim from few besides, because it puts its seal upon the judgment that I had come to four years ago—viz., that I had spent twenty-eight years of most energetic labour in building up what I (now) believe to be the worst sect in Christendom, instead of accomplishing the union of all Christians apart from sectarian distinctions, and placing all ministry under the power and guidance of God’s Spirit, instead of under man’s appointment and control—which were the sole objects that drove me amongst the Plymouth Brethren thirty-two years since. I will not, however, say any more about myself, as my object especially in writing to you was to place before you a very striking proof that you had not mistaken your point in so

pertinaciously charging on Mackintosh the heresy of denying the proper humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Extracts.

“‘Our Lord received *no nature from the first Adam at all* (that is, at His birth); but on the cross did take the Adam position, nature, and life, and then ended the whole in death.’ . . . ‘Does Scripture teach thus—I mean that Christ took a nature on the cross which He had not before? Assuredly it does.’ . . . ‘God made Him to be sin for us, put on Him the iniquity of us all; *and more than that*, made Him to be sin *itself*—all that was in root, as well as in fruit, *at enmity to God*, and then, and so judged, that is damned, sin in all that it was, in nature, character, power, life, and practice.’

“I do not know Mr. Pressland personally, but if these extracts from what he teaches and writes are shallow and stupid, and contain as many heresies as sentences, they are at least his rendering of the more subtly-stated doctrines of his great teacher, Mr. Darby.

“I am entirely outside every shade and division of Brethrenism; and you will probably say, *not before it was time*.

“Pardon my intrusion, and believe me, yours faithfully in Christ,

W. H. DORMAN.”

As Mr. Dorman in early life held an influential position, as I am informed, in the Christian ministry, and afterwards acted a consistent part as one of the leaders of the Plymouths, I considered his testimony so very important that I asked permission to publish the contents of his letter. He at once sent me the whole correspondence in manuscript, with permission to use any part of it I thought proper. This correspondence, I find, was carried on in the year 1867 between Messrs. Bessant, Edmonds, Newman, and Townsend on the one side, and Mr. Pressland on the other (all Plymouths). It was finally referred for decision to Mr. Wigram; but he returned the documents with the remark, that "the less said upon these matters the better." It would never suit to raise opposition in the Darbyite sect against the heresies which the leaders were trying to promulgate.

No passage of Scripture could more clearly establish the Deity of Christ than that one which says, "Feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." According to this, Christ must have been both God and man. If He were God and not man, or man and not God, this passage could not possibly be explained. If Christ be both God and man, this Scripture is perfectly intelligible; but it could not be true on any other principle. If He were not God, His Church could not be called the Church of God; and if He were not man, He could not purchase

His Church with His own blood. It was only as God His Church was the Church of God ; it was only as man He had blood. This portion of Holy Writ is a tower of strength for the Divinity of Christ. Hence the Unitarians and Socinians have exhausted all their ingenuity in endeavouring to overturn the common reading of the passage, but in vain. As my father says, "the present state of the controversy, with respect to Acts xx. 28, clearly establishes the common reading."—"Carson's Works," vol. ii. p. 405.) If I am correctly informed, the Unitarians have endeavoured to show that "Lord," which they look on as an inferior title, might be substituted for "God." In this, however, they have failed. But their failure would not have been so serious, if they had known that a Darby would come to their rescue by giving matters a new turn. Where the best Unitarian critic falters, Darby fearlessly proceeds. He does not deign to stop at trifles. Indeed, if there be one thing which has horrified me more than another with the Darbyite sect, I might, perhaps, say, it is the wonderfully reckless way in which they alter passages of Scripture, in the translation, to suit their own views. They have a facility in this respect that is truly remarkable. "Persons who interpret, *not from their own acquaintance with authors who have written in the language to be interpreted*, but merely *on the authority of lexicons*, will be wonderfully fertile in improvements of the common

version, and in various possible interpretations of almost every passage. Hardly anything in the common translation pleases them; and every new dress that can be given to a passage, is a discovery of the greatest importance. *There can, indeed, be no rule more general than that he who is perpetually mending our version, is but a tyro in criticism.*—"Carson's Works," vol. v. p. 241.)

I do not say our translation of the Scriptures is perfect; but it is so wonderfully near perfection that I would caution my readers to take care of all sects which are found altering the translation in portions which they cannot otherwise manage in accordance with their own peculiar tenets. Some people, such as the Darbyites, find it more easy to change Scripture than to change their own pet views. Beware of all such. No doubt, our translation is incorrect in some parts. This is a great misfortune. It is especially so in passages where the addition of a word has altered the meaning so far, that it makes the passage speak entirely different from what the Spirit intended. Still, the errors of our translation are really so few, that it amounts almost to a miracle in providence that matters should be so exact as they are; and if the parties who are usually so clamorous for new translations were allowed their will, they would make such a pretty hand of the Bible, that we would not know it to be the Word of God. [This pre-

diction is now fulfilled in what is called the New Translation.]

Mr. Darby's reckless conduct in tampering with Acts xx. 28, is so well put by Mr. Ryan that I shall quote his words, as they are found in the third edition of his pamphlet, p. 10. "Unitarian critics and others of the same stamp," says he, "have tried to get rid of this famous passage, and have ransacked all the MSS. to see if the word *Lord* could not be substituted for *God*, in order to weaken the force of the text, but to no avail. It is confirmed by the *Vatican MS.*, the *Codex Sinaiticus*, and by a host of other authorities; besides, St. Paul never, in any of his writings, uses the term 'Church of the Lord,' but always 'the Church of God;' and this is strong internal evidence for the genuineness of the text, so that few readings are now better established than the received text on this point, which also Mr. Darby admits by adopting it in his amended edition of the New Testament, which circulates largely in France. But what does he do, think you? He informs critics and translators that another mode of getting rid of the difficulty has escaped their notice, and instead of the reading, 'Feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood,' they are to read it, 'with the blood of His own *Son*,' thus adding the term *Son* to the text, and thereby neutralising and destroying one truth by another—an old plan of the enemy." My readers will thus see that Mr.

Darby, in the most reckless manner, and as scholars well know, without the slightest grounds, plays into the hand of the Unitarian, by *adding* to the Word of God what the Unitarian would not venture to add for himself. Now, what is the cause of all this? Why is Mr. Darby so anxious about this translation? Is it owing to his deadly hatred to the righteousness of Christ? It is evident if he could prove that the Church of God, in this passage, does not mean the Church of Christ, he would find it more easy to argue that the righteousness of God does not mean the righteousness of Christ. Is this his aim? Is it so, that the righteousness of Christ must be undermined by some means or other? Is it thought better to sacrifice an insuperable proof for the divinity of Christ than to acknowledge His righteousness? Where will Plymouthism end? Under the pretence of scholarship, and the garb of a plausible sanctimoniousness, it twists, turns, and adds to the Word of God. "There is a generation that are pure in their own eyes, and yet is not washed from their filthiness. There is a generation, oh how lofty are their eyes! and their eyelids are lifted up. . . . Whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased. . . . If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book."

The Darbyites hold some ideas regarding John xii. 24, which are difficult to make out. "This is the

special doctrine of Paul," says Mr. Darby ; "no thought of a righteousness of law acquired by another for us. There is atonement for sin, in which we lay, which we had committed as in the first Adam ; but I repeat, no conferring of righteousness on it, but closing its history, and being before God in death, in which He in grace took its place, in respect of the judgment due to it."—"The Righteousness of God," p. 9.) This is a fair sample of Mr. Darby's style of writing. The man who can beat him at rendering a subject unintelligible certainly deserves a medal. It would be an interesting point in mental philosophy to ascertain, how a man who is so utterly incapable could attain a position of influence in an extensive sect. The only way I can account for it is, that they think him very deep, because they cannot understand him. What am I to make of the above extract ? How did we lie in atonement ? How did we commit atonement in Adam ? Perhaps this is not what Mr. Darby intends. He probably means that we lay in the sin. Well, let us try that, and see how it will do with the remainder of the sentence. "No conferring of righteousness on it." How could righteousness be conferred on sin ? "But closing its history." When did sin close its history ? "Being before God in death, in which He in grace took its place." Did God take the place of sin ? The word "sin," then, will not do. Let us try the word "atonement" again. How did we commit atonement in Adam ? How could

righteousness be conferred on atonement? How could God take the place of atonement? How was judgment due to atonement? If any child asks me, in regard to this riddle, "Do you give it up?" I say, I do. It should be inserted in the *Illustrated News* as a standing enigma. "Hence," proceeds Mr. Darby, "there was no connection of sinners with Christ under law. A corn of wheat, except it fall into the ground and die, abides alone; if it die, it brings forth much fruit. We are united to Christ in His new position, where He is the righteous man, at the right hand of God, when He has died unto sin once, and is alive unto God. But if the corn of wheat die alone, as come amongst the family of the first Adam, death is written on all that is of Adam." What does he mean? Can any of my readers tell? I give him up. And yet this is the man who is regarded by his sect as the prince of critics; this is the man who has the presumption to undertake a new translation of the Scriptures!

As Mr. Darby is under "the presidency of the Spirit," he must have received the gift of writing in an unknown tongue, and therefore I leave him and turn to Mr. Mackintosh on the same point. "I would further remind my reader," says he, in "Notes on Exodus," p. 135, "that the obedient *life* of Christ is not set forth in Scripture as the procuring cause of our forgiveness. . . . It is by 'His stripes,' not by His obedient life, that 'we are healed,' and those stripes

He endured *on the cross*, and nowhere else." Who says, Mr. Mackintosh, we are healed and get forgiveness for our sins by the obedience of Christ's life? You have a wonderful facility in raising up ideas for your opponents which you know they do not hold, in order that you may have an opportunity of appearing to overturn them. Why do you not meet your opponents fairly? Why do you not act like a man? We do not hold—you know we do not hold—that our sins are atoned for by the life of Christ. His life was not a life of atonement, but a life of obedience. He obeyed the law for us in His life, and He paid the penalty for our sins in His death; and the result is that we are not only *forgiven*, but we are also rendered perfectly *innocent* and spotless. It is not only, who can *punish* us? but also, who can lay *anything to our charge*? We are innocent. Your plan can never bring innocence, or freedom from guilt. It is only a pardon. "He says," continues Mr. Mackintosh, "'except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone.' He was that precious corn of wheat; and He should have remained for ever alone, even though incarnate, had He not, by His death upon the accursed tree, removed out of the way everything that could have hindered the union of His people with Him in resurrection." There is not a word in this passage to support the Plymouth views about obedience; nor does it refer in any way, as they *assume* without proof, to the union

of Christ and His people. When fairly dealt by, the text is as plain as possible. It demonstrates that, without dying, Christ could not take His people to heaven ; if He had gone there Himself, He must have gone alone ; the cross was essential to the salvation of His people. The passage teaches that if He had not died, He would have had no fruit ; but that dying He would “bring forth much fruit ;” in other words, that if He died He would save multitudes, but without death He could not save one. The cross was absolutely necessary. This is the plain import of the text ; it deals with the fruit which is to result from Christ’s death,—namely, the accomplishment of the salvation of His people ; but it does not give even so much as a hint on the subject of the union between Him and His chosen ones. If a man had never heard of the doctrine concerning the union of Christ and His people, he could not possibly learn anything either for or against it from this passage ; hence it is evident that the text does not refer at all to the doctrine. It does not say one word on *either side* of the question. It nowhere tells us, as the Darbyites do, that there was no union with Christ till after His ascension to glory ; and, as a necessary consequence of this, that the Christian was never crucified with Christ, never died with Him, was never buried with Him, never rose with Him, and never ascended with Him to glory. It contains no such dreadful Darbyite sentiments. It just demonstrates that the cross was essen-

tial to the salvation of His people ; and that if He had gone to heaven without it, He must have gone alone, as, under these circumstances, He could not take His people with Him. But it does not follow from this that His life was useless ; nor yet that the obedience of His life was not in the room of His people. The text does not say one word on that subject. Mr. Mackintosh's argument is founded on the supposition that his opponents are foolish enough to imagine that the half of Christ's work was as good as the whole ; that His life would take sinners to heaven without His death. They hold no such principles. Their system is a consistent whole. They maintain that everything which Christ did was essential. He did nothing in vain. His people are so united to Him that they are one with Him in the obedience of His life, in His death, in His burial, in His resurrection, and in His ascension into glory. For them He lived, for them He died, for them He rose again. They did not help Him to obey, they did not help Him to die, they did not help Him to rise from the grave. But as they are one with Him, they are united to Him in life, death, burial, resurrection, ascension, and glorification.

MORALITY OF PLYMOUTHISM.

THE effects of denying the moral law as a rule of life are well exemplified in the recklessness of the state-

ments which are made by the Darbyite Plymouths. Let us take a few examples by way of illustration. "When the statement as to the Jersey meeting was being read at East Street," says Mr. Eland, "Mr. Morrish stated that it was not accepted as authentic ; and that 'the statement' was so barefaced and unfair that Mr. Stewart's own friends would not hear of its being printed. . . . He said Mr. Wigram was the friend he particularly alluded to ; and he promised (when called to account) to write to Mr. Wigram for confirmation or otherwise of the statement, and to show Mr. Wigram's reply. On receiving Mr. Wigram's letter, Mr. Morrish refused to fulfil his promise, and publicly retracted his statement."—"Statement of Facts," p. 11.) This plan of stating things which are without foundation, and then retracting them when called to account, is exceedingly convenient.

On the 22d of May 1862 I wrote to the *Coleraine Chronicle* as follows :—"I was no little surprised at receiving a letter from a minister in Queen's County, informing me that a lady has been counteracting the effects of my letters by belying my character. The following is the reply which I sent to the minister. 'I am sorry to hear that the lady you refer to at Mount Mellick should be trying to counteract the effects of my letters by stating that I had belonged to Mr. Mackintosh's party and had been cut off, and that I was writing my letters through spleen at the

excommunication. It is lamentable to think that any lady should knowingly and wilfully *invent* such a diabolical falsehood, without even the shadow of the shade of grounds for it, and at the same time disgrace the name of Christian by calling herself a Christian. She cannot be a Christian and act thus. So far from having ever been expelled by the Plymouth Brethren, as this lady has stated, I never in any way belonged to them ; I never in my life, except *once* when at college in Dublin, was inside any of their places of worship ; and I never gave them support in any way, because I detested their jesuitical principles. You are at liberty to make any use truth demands of this letter.” When this appeared in the paper, one of the leaders “under the presidency of the Spirit” in Coleraine took up the fight. He knew I had never been in fellowship with the “Brethren,” and therefore never was cut off ; but still he must rescue the lady in some way from her malicious falsehood. How did he do it ? He says, “There is a confounding of Dr. Carson with Mr. Ryan in the matter the Doctor refers to about the lady at Mount Mellick ; because Mr. Ryan was in fellowship with Brethren.” The plain meaning of this is, that the lady was right about the cutting off, but mistook the *person*, and substituted Dr. Carson, who never was in fellowship, for Mr. Ryan, who was in fellowship. I was anxious to know exactly how this matter stood, and therefore I at once wrote to Mr. Ryan on the subject.

In reply, he says, "I *never* had the honour, or the dishonour, as it might be variously esteemed, of being cut off by the Brethren in Coleraine, or in Dublin, or *anywhere else*." This placed the Coleraine "apostle" in an awkward predicament,—a predicament from which all his "inspiration" has failed to release him.

"There is a difficulty," says Dr. Tregelles, "which has deterred some from setting forth true doctrine, in opposition to Brethrenite teaching ; it is the *unscrupulous* (and at times successful) manner in which they asperse any one who firmly does this. . . . To meet open attack is comparatively easy ; but it is often impossible to meet secret slander ; and this it is which does the worst mischief. How can I repel the quiet whisper of some one who, in the semblance of holiness, insinuates that I maintain something very evil, especially if he says that it is too evil to be stated ?" No man of honour has a fair chance with such parties as are here referred to. *It is one of the special marks* of the Darbyite Plymouths, that, if they are unable to meet a man fairly and openly, they will whisper about any amount of falsehoods for the sake of accomplishing their purposes. Their underhand misrepresentations regarding personal character, combined with the jesuitical way in which they couch their sentiments in language which they interpret after a manner peculiar to themselves, enable them to "deceive the very elect." "This will be enough," continues Dr. Tregelles,

“to satisfy straightforward persons as to Mr. Darby’s want of reliability. . . . Mr. Darby denied that the word ‘with’ is found in the sentence ; but this was merely one of his groundless assertions : that the word is there all others can see. . . . Do Mr. Darby’s followers definitely, and without reserve, condemn these false statements? and do they own that his assertions on other subjects are habitually as unworthy of credit?”—(“Five Letters.”)

Mr. Ryan wrote a pamphlet in the form of a dialogue, in which he took special exception to certain opinions which were published by Mr. Darby in “The Bible Treasury,” &c., &c. In place of writing a formal reply to Mr. Ryan, Mr. Darby reprinted, as he said, the articles complained of, in order that his readers might judge of the correctness of the charges brought against him. In the preface to this reprint, Mr. Darby says : “Recently an attack has been made on the doctrine contained in them, and in other articles, to which I will just now refer. . . . The reader will find them here exactly as they were originally published. . . . My only path was to publish all exactly as it had already appeared. . . . Whatever they are, you have them here, my reader, just as they were.” Could anything in the world be fairer than this? Nothing. There is no fairer or more reliable and successful way of meeting a charge, if it be false, than that of reprinting every word upon which the charge

is founded. What, then, does the course adopted by Mr. Darby want? It wants nothing imaginable, it appears, *except truthfulness*; that, however, should be a mere trifle with those who repudiate the moral law as a rule of life. "Can the reader believe," says Mr. Ryan, in the third edition of his pamphlet, "that, in the face of all this boasted exactness, *one entire article is suppressed*—that article in 'The Bible Treasury' containing the famous passage where our Lord is described at the close of His life, and in Gethsemane, as going through the experiences of unconverted Jews 'with the full letting loose of the power of Satan upon them,' and, in consequence, 'the wrath of God staring Him in the face.' It is neither fair nor right to suppress the entire article, and at the same time tell his readers he has given *them all exactly* as they appeared." I have read Mr. Darby's reply to this charge, and I must say a more contemptible piece of shuffling I never beheld. He cannot deny that the article which was omitted consisted of the notes of his own lecture; he cannot deny that he had an opportunity of looking over it for the press; he has to admit that he knows it is his own; he cannot deny that this very article, which contained most obnoxious sentiments, was omitted completely in the reprint. Why, then, did he affirm three times over that he had reprinted all exactly as they originally appeared? Why did he find it convenient to leave out the one which

was mainly found fault with? Above all, when one was left out, why did he tell his readers they were all in? This charge does not involve a matter of mere opinion; it is a matter of fact; and, therefore, there can be no excuse for Mr. Darby's conduct in regard to it. His statement is a direct falsehood.

There is a complete want of honesty in the conduct of those who pretend to believe in the presidency of the Spirit at their meetings, as is shown by the following extracts from Mr. Wigram's letter, as printed by Mr. Eland in the "Jersey Case":—"Mr. Stewart shamelessly gave notice" [under the presidency of the Spirit!] "(at Davies Street, after the gospel by J. N. Darby, on last Sunday week) of a factious meeting to be held at Islington. . . . Again, and again, and again, he forced himself self-willedly" [under the presidency of the Spirit!] "on the priory, at the table of the Lord, and at other meetings. . . . I do not think that the table of the Lord, or the gatherings of the saints" [under the presidency of the Spirit!] "are to be the only places in which a right to speak and obtrude one's self on others is to be allowed. I do not know to what extent it might in patience, but certainly there is a point beyond which the allowance of interruption becomes the sanction of disorder. . . . Self-will, and self-esteem, and human energy" [under the presidency of the Spirit!] "cannot be sanctioned beyond a point, and when that was reached, saints

were obliged to act" [man acting!] . . . "I have no doubt whatever, in my own mind," he continues, "that Satan" [under the presidency of the Spirit!] "has a very large place in the whole thing." When will the doctrine which assigns superiority to Satan under the presidency of the Holy Spirit come to an end? Can any person imagine that these men truly believe in their own statements? I have it on excellent authority that Mr. Bellett, of Dublin, had a good plan of managing the Spirit, if I may use such an expression. When any of the members addressed the meeting, Mr. Bellett frequently made a habit of keeping silence for that day. This, however, did not please the audience, as they preferred to hear Mr. Bellett. What, then, was to be done? A very effectual method was adopted. The ladies of the assembly gave a good tongue-thrashing to the unfortunate ghost who presumed to edify them. This, of course, had the desired effect. But there could be no greater specimen of genuine hypocrisy than for the parties who act thus to say, as they do, that they are under "the sovereign guidance of the Holy Ghost;" or as Mr. Darby put it, "It is a manifestation of the Spirit in the individual who acts; it is a gift, and, if you please, an impulse; it is God acting." According to this, God is acting through the man who speaks, and the Holy Spirit is presiding over the ladies who are forming the determination to stop the action of God in the man!!

Dr. Tregelles informs us that "there have emanated from Dublin professed extracts from the writings of the Reformers, and others, in which the liberty has been taken of altering their words and doctrines, so as to suit the taste and theology of the reviser. There is no intimation given of such changes having been made; all appears under some known and venerable name; so that the doctrines are ascribed to some ancient writer, which really are those of some modern Brethrenite. I am informed that such tracts have been circulated by thousands. . . . When I remonstrated against such use having been made of the names of Reformers, I was told that it had been done 'for the honour of God.'"—"Five Letters," p. 21.) Verily, it would never do for such parties to accept the moral law as the rule of their life.

In his sermon of 29th January 1865, Mr. Spurgeon charged the Plymouths with holding that it was wrong for the Christian to make a *confession* of sin. No sooner did this appear in print than the Plymouths came down upon him for misrepresenting their views. The consequence was, that Mr. Spurgeon shortly afterwards published the following:—"In a former sermon, while denouncing the error of the 'nonconfession of sin by believers,' we wrongly imputed that gross heresy to the Plymouth Brethren. We have since learned that the persons to whom we alluded have been expelled from that body, and we

therefore desire to exonerate the community from a fault of which they are not guilty. We are sorry to have made this charge, as it is far from our wish to speak evil of any ; but we were not aware of the expulsion of the guilty persons." Mr. Spurgeon here acts the part of a straightforward, honourable man, as he always does, and confesses the mistake he had fallen into ; but do his opponents act in the same straightforward manner towards him ? By no means. He has so many things to attend to that it is impossible for him to become thoroughly acquainted with all the peculiarities of a Jesuitical sect like the Darbyites, and therefore they took advantage of his innocence. He was indeed wrong in stating that they did not confess sin. I know of no parties who are so constantly confessing as they. This is quite a peculiarity of their sect. They seem to be very regardless of what they say, but they try to make up for their want of truthfulness by their confessions to each other. The cry, Confess, confess, confess, is hardly ever out of their mouth. They are at no loss upon this point ; and therefore they are quite right in drawing Mr. Spurgeon's attention to his mistake. Did they deal fairly with him, however, in this matter ? They did not. They put him right, in part, regarding the confession, but they omitted the other end of the sentence. They told a part of the truth, but they did not tell the whole truth. They said they would confess, but they

did not inform him that they positively refused to *ask forgiveness* for the sins they confessed ; nor did they inform him of the distinction which they make between confessing to God and confessing to each other. Their jesuitical dealing in this matter is very apparent. They obtained a triumph for their system by showing that Mr. Spurgeon was wrong, and that he was obliged to acknowledge his error ; but they had not the candour to inform him and the public that their confession is a solemn mockery, as they absolutely refuse to ask pardon from God for the sins they confess to each other. Their withholding of the truth, regarding their refusal to ask the *forgiveness* of the sins they confess, is just another example of that deep jesuitical plan which underlies and pervades their whole system. It is by deception, covered by a sanctimonious garb, that they have drawn the simple and the unwary into their nets.

On the 4th of December 1862, I received a letter from a friend in Scotland, informing me that he had just been reading a pamphlet, by Mr. Darby, which professed to reply to me. I wrote to my friend by the next post, requesting him to forward me his copy of Mr. Darby's work with as little delay as possible. On the 8th of December, I got the pamphlet, as well as a letter from my friend, enclosing a note which he had received from Mr. Catesby Paget. In that letter my friend mentioned that he had written to Mr. Paget,

informing him that he had sent his note and Mr. Darby's pamphlet to me, because he thought I was being dishonourably dealt with. I found by Mr. Paget's note that he requested my friend "to *return at once*" the copy of Mr. Darby's pamphlet, which he had sent him, as he had discovered that "it was not actually for sale yet." "If you return it to me," he continues, "you shall have two other copies in about a week or so, one for yourself, the other for Dr. Carson, and then it will be open, of course, for the sharpest criticism that can be applied to it." My friend very properly thought the transaction an extraordinary one, and therefore he told Mr. Paget he had placed the whole affair in my hands. It was evident the Jesuits were once more at work; but I could not then divine the exact nature of the trick. I could not discover the reason for so much secrecy about a pamphlet which I found, on examination, *was actually printed at Toronto in Canada*. It was plain, however, that there must be some very special reason for the great anxiety shown to get back that American copy, in order that it might be replaced in a week or so by others, which would be open to the sharpest criticism. It struck me that there must be two editions—one specially suited for the Plymouthites, and one for the public.

In the Toronto printed edition, Mr. Darby opens the battle against me with the following remarks:—

"The reader may judge of the kind of thing it [Dr. Carson's pamphlet] is by learning that while the first page assures us it is the first five thousand, the last, the very same side of the same sheet, assures us that the first five thousand are all sold! It is painful to have to do with such adversaries." If Mr. Darby means to assert that the statements on the first and last pages of the cover are necessarily contradictory to each other, he asserts a thing which he *must* know to be false. He *cannot* be so stupid as to confound *sale* with *delivery*. Be this as it may, he here most emphatically charges me that my pamphlet bears a lie on its cover. I cannot allow this to pass without due attention. My letters were first published in the *Coleraine Chronicle*. They excited so much interest that I announced in the *Chronicle* that I was going to publish them in a pamphlet at a particular price. The orders for copies came showering in to me at such a rate, that before the pamphlet had time to be entirely printed, I had actually sold five thousand copies, and had given orders to the printer to pull off five thousand more. There was not a *single copy* of the first five thousand unsold at the time its cover was printed, so that the statement on the cover, that it was the first five thousand, and that the first five thousand was sold before the cover was printed, is absolutely, literally, and, in every sense of the word, true. I therefore fling back Mr. Darby's base insinua-

tion. I beg to inform him that I am no Darbyite, that I do not deny the moral law as the rule of my life. I have not yet adopted the religion which permits a man to tell as many falsehoods as will answer his purpose, provided only he makes a sufficiently abject *confession* to his fellow-mortals, and that, too, without asking *forgiveness* from the Almighty.

In the course of a short time, I discovered that my surmise about there being two editions of Mr. Darby's pamphlet was quite correct. I have got them both. The one was printed in Canada, and the other in England. In the Canadian copy, Mr. Darby has attempted to overturn my moral character, by making a statement, containing an insinuation which I have proved to be utterly false. Of course, if he could satisfy his miserable dupes that I was a liar, he would go very far towards removing any impressions which my pamphlet might have made upon them. But inasmuch as his false insinuations would recoil with double force on his own head, if by any chance they came under my eye, it was found necessary to print another edition, in which the accusation against me is omitted. In all probability, I would never have known anything about the publication of this statement against my moral character, and would never have had an opportunity of proving its falsehood, if it had not been for the mistake made by Mr. Catesby Paget in sending a copy of the Plymouthite edition to

a friend of mine who is not a Plymouth, and who could not possibly stand such abominable trickery. This is the edition which Mr. Paget says was not ready for sale, although I have heard, from a person who saw them, that several Plymouths in this district have got copies. After hearing of their existence, I managed to pick up two of them myself; and I have also obtained a copy of the edition in which the falsehood about my moral character is omitted—the edition which will be open to the sharpest criticism. That this is all an intentional trick, is proved by the fact, that no mention is made of the false statement contained in the other edition having been omitted from this one; that no apology is offered to me for its previous existence; and that no allusion whatever is made to the subject. If I had not providentially seen the Canadian edition, I could never have discovered by the English copy that my character had been basely traduced in the Canadian publication. Now, I seriously ask my readers what they think of this transaction? What estimate do they form of the man, or the men, who could be concerned, either directly or indirectly, in such proceedings? Could any one imagine the devil himself, almost, to be guilty of such devices? Could any conduct in the world be more detestable than that of blackening a man's character without giving him an opportunity of reply? When they find themselves unable to meet my argu-

ments, they follow the example of the lady at Mount Mellick, and try to destroy their effect by undermining my character by a false statement, which, only for the hand of Providence, would never have reached my eyes.

Since I exposed this Plymouthite trick, Mr. Darby and Mr. Paget have both found it necessary to return to the point. We shall now see how far they have improved their position. In his pamphlet on "Righteousness and Law," Mr. Darby says, "I am quite willing to accept Dr. Carson's explanation of the contradiction on the cover of his tract." What does the man mean? How could he accept any explanation of a contradiction? How could a contradiction ever become true? Perhaps with Plymouths it might; but it could not with any sensible man in the world. Mr. Darby must know, as well as he is alive, that he is making a false statement, when he says the cover contains a contradiction. If he thought it contained a contradiction, how could he "accept of Dr. Carson's explanation?" The acceptance of the explanation proves that he does not believe in his own statement. What is the advertisement on the cover with which Mr. Darby finds fault? A Plymouthite lady sent me, long since, a copy of the pamphlet, with all her objections written on the margin of the leaves. I did not place much value on her criticisms, but I was glad to get hold of the advertisement on the cover. Here it is:—"The first five thousand of this

pamphlet have been already sold ; but copies of the second five thousand may be had from the author." Where is the contradiction here? Nowhere. As a matter of course, the cover of the pamphlet, containing the title on the first page, and the advertisement on the last page, was printed after the rest of the work. Where, then, was the contradiction in stating on this cover that it was the first five thousand, and that all the copies contained in it were already sold ; but the second five thousand could be had from the author? Nowhere. It was every word true. There was not one single copy of that edition unsold at the time that was printed. Hence there is no contradiction : no untruth. It is impossible, by the utmost stretch of charity, to suppose that Mr. Darby could be ignorant on this point. An inhabitant of the land of Tob might perhaps make a mistake here ; but a man like Mr. Darby, who is accustomed to the public press, could not. Mr. Darby knows right well that there are plenty of books subscribed for by the trade, or the public, and consequently sold before one line of them is printed. Nay, more, he knows that in almost every business transaction the sale precedes the delivery. Suppose a man goes to the Encumbered Estates Court, in Dublin, and sells an estate under the auctioneer's hammer. On his return, he meets Mr. Darby, and tells him that he has sold his estate ; Mr. Darby asks if he has yet given possession ; the man says, No, he has

only just sold. Mr. Darby at once, in the most polite manner, informs him that he is a liar, because there is nothing sold until after it is delivered ! What would be thought of this ? And yet this is the sort of unprincipled bosh which I am called upon to meet. It is utterly impossible, by any amount of charity, to suppose that Mr. Darby is so ignorant as to confound sale with delivery. He is not so stupid as that would come to, and therefore he cannot get credit for having made his statement through ignorance ; it must have been intentional and diabolically malicious.

“ But,” continues Mr. Darby, “ I still think it was a glaring contradiction to sell a tract which positively declared that *it* was one of the first five thousand, then and there sold, and to state on the back of the same cover, that that first five thousand were all sold already.” Mr. Darby must know that the insinuation contained in this sentence is not true, because he knows he did not buy the tract *from me*. If he bought the tract from a person who previously bought it from me, there is no contradiction whatever on my part. Again, Mr. Darby might sell that same tract to another, and it might be sold five hundred times over, and yet the statement on the cover would be perfectly true. Nay, more, if the printer, or binder, had, by any mischance, mixed a few copies of the two parcels, as they passed through his hands, so as to have the one delivered in mistake

for the other, it would not in the slightest degree affect the advertisement. Still, further, if I were now to collect those five thousand copies, and sell them all over again *myself*, the advertisement on the cover would, after all, be perfectly and literally true. So that Mr. Darby has no shadow of excuse for his insinuations. "Dr. Carson's statement may explain it," says he, "but the thing to be explained remains a contradiction on the face of it." Sense again! According to this head of wit, a thing which he considers a self-evident contradiction is capable of a reliable explanation. After all, in place of holding Mr. Darby responsible for what he says, I should place him on the shelf with the simpletons. "I know nothing," continues Mr. Darby, "of what was ordered of Dr. Carson; but I know that a tract was bought for me, which professed to be itself one of the first five thousand, and which also declared that the first five thousand were all sold." Mr. Darby may be ignorant of "what was ordered of Dr. Carson," but if he had taken the trouble of asking information from his own followers in the north of Ireland, they would have given him *some* idea on the subject. They could have told him, with bitter anguish and sorrow of heart, that various ministers throughout the country purchased the pamphlet in such large quantities for circulation in their districts, that it fell like a perfect thunderstorm on the heads of the unfortunate Ply-

mouths. There is nothing remarkable in the fact that a copy of the first five thousand was purchased for Mr. Darby. I have no doubt he might have purchased hundreds of them. It is possible that even now he could find some copies for sale. Some of the ministers who purchased from me circulated their copies gratuitously ; some sold them amongst their people ; some put them into the hands of booksellers ; and one commercial traveller, who afterwards became a minister, bought one thousand copies, with the view, as I have since ascertained, of having the greater part of them sold by the booksellers in the different towns which he visited throughout Ireland. Under these circumstances, Mr. Darby might have purchased hundreds of them ; but that would not in the slightest degree affect the truth of the advertisement on the cover of the pamphlet. It is quite impossible for Mr. Darby, or any other man, to shake the truth of it.

Mr. Darby says the obnoxious passage was struck out of the English edition of his pamphlet, without his knowledge, by a friend of his own, and at the suggestion of the publisher. This might have cleared Mr. Darby of the trick, if he had been manly enough to have made an ample apology for the whole affair ; but, inasmuch as he had not sufficient honour to enable him to do so, he must still be held responsible. Besides, under any circumstances, the trick must still lie at the door of his Plymouthite friends. It is still

amongst the Plymouths, and is just like them. They like to give a stab in the dark, and to keep it dark. In regard to what his friend has done, Mr. Darby says, "He struck his pen through the passage, judging, I suppose, the point referred to beneath notice." Now, I solemnly ask Mr. Darby, does he really believe he is here stating the truth? does he really suppose, as he says, that his friend struck it out because he judged it a point unworthy of notice? Could any man imagine Mr. Darby believes he is here stating the truth? Could any argument more powerful for putting me to the wall be produced, than the fact, if such a fact existed, that I had placed an intentional falsehood on the cover of my pamphlet? None. If I had been guilty of such conduct, my reputation was not worth a farthing. Hence it is impossible to suppose Mr. Darby believes in his own statement, when he says he thinks the passage was struck out because it was judged to be unworthy of notice. If Mr. Darby had been endowed with sufficiently high and honourable principles to have enabled him to publish an ample apology for the whole affair, he would to a great extent have redeemed his position; but in place of this, he hardly goes the length of fully accepting my explanation. If he imagines I care one straw whether he accepts it or not, he is woefully mistaken. I ask no favour of him or any one else. I dare him to attempt to overthrow my explanation.

This is entirely beyond his power. It is true in every letter, and will be accepted as such by every honest man who reads it. I have no idea of taking his acceptance of it as a compliment ; I demand it as a right ; and if he had been possessed of the refined feelings of a gentleman, he would have retraced his steps by a most ample apology. A compliment, indeed, for Mr. Darby to accept an explanation which he and all the Plymouths in the world could not overturn ! But to crown all, Mr. Darby now says, "There is no statement that Dr. Carson told an untruth." In all the world, where does this man mean to end ! In his first pamphlet he says, "The reader may judge of the kind of thing it (Dr. Carson's pamphlet) is, by learning that, while the first page assures us it is the first five thousand, the last, the very same side of the same sheet, assures us that the first five thousand are all sold ! It is painful to have to do with such adversaries." Now, it would be impossible to imagine any language which could more directly insinuate that Dr. Carson was a liar, and therefore it was painful to have to deal with him as an adversary on religious questions. This point could not be made plainer. But the moment Mr. Darby reads my answer, and finds that his accusation is totally and utterly false, in place of apologising like a man of honour and principle, he turns round and denies that he ever stated I had told an untruth. This is truly Darby all the

world over. It is distressing beyond measure to have to deal with such an adversary. It is no wonder he denies the moral law as the rule of his life.

I now turn to Mr. Paget. In a letter which I received from him, he says: "I have read your pamphlet. You justly condemn Mr. Darby for making a false charge against you. It is clear that what you have proved to be strictly and literally a true statement raised a suspicion in his mind of an opposite character; having entertained it, it takes shape and form, and is given forth as a proved instance of dishonesty. You have acted with regard to my letter to Mr. — in the same way. You state how you came by Mr. D.'s tract, and quote my words. A suspicion enters your mind, you entertain it, it takes form and shape, and though you own you 'cannot discover,' &c., and propose a possible solution by a question which you also own you cannot answer, you proceed to pronounce upon it as a proved instance of jesuitism, and express your sorrow that Mr. Paget should lend himself, however unwittingly, to 'such disgusting trickery.' May I ask you whether it was justifiable to make such a charge, based on no other ground than your own suspicions, and which I now declare to be entirely false? I could explain in the broad light of day all that which you have so unjustly charged as 'disgusting trickery,' and disprove your charge as easily as you have Mr. Darby's false charge

against yourself. I have before me the 'other' copy which I should have sent you, had Mr —— been able to return me the one I asked for, and you would see in that the original charge against you, a few corrections of the press in ink, and three lines of new print pasted over a short sentence needing correction. The *new* edition, to which you refer, I had never seen, nor did I know of its existence till I read your pamphlet. Whether it has superseded the first edition I know not, but this I do know, that it would have been a copy of the *original* edition, corrected as I have just described, of which a copy would have been sent you. Can you not imagine the possibility of an edition being printed, and a few copies sold in the ordinary way, and then, *because* it was only a few copies that had got into circulation, a desire being felt to stop the sale for a week in order to make a small alteration? I know that I have done the same with regard to a controversial tract, and did not think I was doing anything particularly dishonourable nor jesuitical thereby." As I have no wish to place Mr. Paget in a false position, I have thus allowed him to speak for himself, and make his own explanation. I am anxious, as far as possible, to release him from the charge; but the only way in which I can see it possible to do so, is to suppose that he has become the innocent dupe of others. Although I am anxious to believe what he so positively declares, there are

some things which I cannot accept. He asks me if I could not imagine an edition being printed, and, *because only a few copies* were sold, the sale might be stopped for a week or so to make some alterations. Well, I could imagine this to occur honestly and fairly, but I could not possibly imagine it in this particular case, just because it is utterly inconsistent with facts. It must not be forgotten that the copy of the pamphlet which Mr. Paget sent to my friend in Scotland was printed *at Toronto, in Canada, under Mr. Darby's own eye*; and that Mr. Darby says, in reference to that edition, that it "sold *largely* to all kinds of people there, while a number were sent to England." Hence Mr. Paget's explanation cannot apply to the case at all. The explanation of its being withdrawn for correction, because only a few copies had got into circulation, cannot be accepted in regard to a pamphlet which *Mr. Darby says was printed under his own eye in Canada*, and sold largely to various people there, whilst a number of them also were sent to England. Neither can I reconcile the letter Mr. Paget wrote to me with the one he wrote to my friend. In his letter to me, he says that the "other" copy, which he would have sent me if my friend had returned him the first, would not have been the new edition with the obnoxious sentence left out, but the *original*, Canadian printed edition, with a few corrections in ink, and a printed patch on a sentence requiring correction.

•

This, however, is difficult to reconcile with his letter to my friend, in which, after requesting the copy to be returned, he says, "I was not aware when I got it that it is not actually for sale yet." How could he say this of the edition which Mr. Darby informs us was printed under his own eye in Canada, and had met an extensive sale? On what principle could it be said in reference to a work which, perhaps, was nearly all sold out, that it was not ready for sale yet? I cannot see the way to reconcile Mr. Paget's own statements with each other; nevertheless, I am disposed to think that he has been taken in by those parties who informed him that the Canadian edition "is not actually for sale yet," although it was then, to a large extent, disposed of. I imagine he has become the dupe of others without being aware of the exact nature of their tricks.

In his reply to Mr. Trench, Mr. Darby says: "I turn to his objections. The first is very simple. He was told of Brethren that any person in the apparel of a man could speak. Any sensible person can see this is simply maintaining the scriptural rule." Mr. Darby admits that if he is only in the apparel of a man, the Scripture authorises him to speak. Mr. D. may believe this if he likes; but does he honestly believe it? The remainder of the paragraph from which I have quoted proves he does not. "It is left free," says he, "in meetings which are not preachings nor lectures, but

assemblies of saints, according to the clear scriptural rule, to all Brethren who can edify, to do so. We glory in this." Now, I want to know why he slips in here the words, "who can edify." This makes a totally different case. The objection is, that "any person in the apparel of a man," without any regard to the power of edifying, could speak. Why does Mr. Darby not meet this fairly, in place of slyly slipping in the expression, "who can edify?" Can he pretend that he here acts the part of an honest controversialist? Certainly not. It is most distressing to have to do with opponents of this class. Again, in his letter of 1868 to the *Church Observer*, as published in Canada, Mr. Darby says, "I repeat, charging Mr. Mackintosh with denying the true humanity of Christ is a foul falsehood, and, after the matter has been sifted, as it has, a disgrace to those only who bring the accusation, as in truth it always was." My accusation against Mr. Mackintosh is here characterised as a *foul falsehood*, that could disgrace only myself, and that it always did so. This is Mr. Darby's assertion. Does he believe in the truth of his own statement? He does not. If I wanted to prove the truth of my accusation against Mr. Mackintosh, I might refer to all I have said elsewhere on the subject; but this is not my object at present. I only wish just now to prove the dishonesty of Mr. Darby as a controversialist. He has here stated that it was always a disgrace to

me to have made the charge I did against Mr. Mackintosh, because it was a "foul falsehood." How am I to prove that Mr. Darby knew he was here making a false statement? Just out of his own mouth. In his "Righteousness and Law," he says, "Mr. Mackintosh did overstep the bounds of Scripture statement. He used language open to attack, and I have no doubt his mind, in opposing one extreme, had gone into the opposite. . . . Subsequently he published a declaration that he had made a wrong statement, and that it was to be condemned wherever it might be found. I have no doubt his mind had overstepped the bounds of Scripture. . . . There was a root of unscriptural thought in his mind. I hold it a great mercy that it was brought out to light. The true humanity of Christ is a fundamental truth, and His person and salvation are given up if it be touched. . . . Mr. Mackintosh is, of course, bound in the Lord to do all needed to remove any evil flowing from his words." What think you of this, reader? Can you believe your eyes? Is this not a most distressing case? Can any man who acts thus have the slightest pretensions to Christianity? The commonest man who walks the streets of London would hardly disgrace himself by such conduct. Mr. Darby here states that Mr. Mackintosh overstepped the bounds of Scripture; used language open to attack; allowed his mind to go from one extreme on the humanity of Christ to the

opposite extreme ; had a root of unscriptural thought in his mind, which was mercifully brought to light, and the evil flowing from which he was bound to remove ; and after all—wonderful to relate !—he asserts, in his letter to the *Canadian Observer* (which, of course, he would not expect *me* to see), that my accusation against Mr. Mackintosh on these points is a “foul falsehood.” We here see that, judged out of his own mouth, it would be difficult to get any man so utterly regardless of truth. He does well to reject the moral law as the rule of his life. Such is the morality of Darbyite Plymouthism !

MR. MACKINTOSH'S RECANTATION.

“ I FEEL it due to God, to His Church, and to my own conscience, to acknowledge that I made a wrong statement in the first edition of my ‘Notes on Leviticus,’ p. 35, in the following passage :—‘The second Man was, *as to His manhood*, the Lord from heaven.’ This mistake, together with the serious inference deducible from it, was pointed out to me by a dear and venerable servant of Christ, who requested me to reconsider the passage, and correct it in the second edition. I did *correct* the mistake, and added a note, not to guard error, but to guard the truth. But this, I feel, was not enough. I ought to have *confessed* the mistake, and should have done so in the preface to the second

edition, had I been sufficiently self-emptyied and careless of my reputation as a writer. I do reverently believe that our blessed Lord Jesus Christ was 'made of the seed of David, according to the flesh ;'—that He was truly of the substance of the Virgin—'flesh and blood,' as really a man as I am, in every respect, sin excepted. The reader will find this grand foundation-truth of Christianity distinctly laid down in various passages of the first edition (see pp. 36, 37). I never meant to teach any other doctrine, and if any expression ever dropped from my lips, or from my pen, which might seem to touch the precious, holy, and essential mystery of incarnation, I would utterly repudiate it.

"C. H. MACKINTOSH.

"47 MOUNTJOY STREET, DUBLIN,
July 1862."

The more I examine this document, the more I am surprised. Mr. Mackintosh is greatly mistaken if he imagines he has improved his position by it. On the contrary, it makes him tenfold worse than at first. He says, "I do reverently believe that our blessed Lord Jesus Christ was . . . as really a man as I am, in every respect, sin excepted. . . . I *never meant to teach any other doctrine.*" If Mr. Mackintosh imagines his readers are going to accept of this statement, he

must give them credit for an incalculable amount of credulity. In considering this point, it must be kept specially in mind that Mr. Mackintosh was at one time a schoolmaster at Westport, in the county Mayo. Consequently he must have understood the language which he undertook to teach. We cannot possibly give him credit for being such a thorough ignoramus as not to know the meaning of some of the simplest words in the English tongue. Hence, when he tells us that, in using the expression, "The second Man was, *as to His manhood*, the Lord from heaven," he "never meant to teach any other doctrine" than that "Jesus Christ was as really a man as I am, in every respect, sin excepted," he makes a statement which is utterly incredible. If I say Christ, in His Godhead, was the Lord from heaven, I must have a special object in putting in His Godhead, and no man can misunderstand the language. In like manner, when Mr. Mackintosh said, "Christ, *as to His manhood*, was the Lord from heaven," he must have had a special object in adding the words "*as to His manhood*," *which are not in Scripture*, and no man can misunderstand his meaning. If he had no special object in the language he used, he is utterly incapable of writing on any subject. But as he was once a schoolmaster, we cannot give him credit for such extraordinary ignorance. He knew right well what he was saying. I ask the simplest and most ignorant of my readers, Do they think they could use

Mr. Mackintosh's language without knowing what sentiments they were expressing? Could they tell us the devil was leading the professing Church astray on the humanity of Christ, and then slip in the words, "As to His manhood," He was the Lord from heaven, without having any design in it? If they did so without being aware of what they were doing, would they not have the fear of Bedlam before their eyes? If they were anxious to teach the doctrine of the proper humanity of Christ, would they ever attempt to do so by saying, "As to His manhood, He was the Lord from heaven?" And yet Mr. Mackintosh wishes us to believe that he *never meant* to teach anything else than the real manhood of Christ by the expression, "As to His manhood, He was the Lord from heaven." Those who think proper may believe this. I cannot.

If Mr. Mackintosh's statement, that he never meant to teach any other doctrine than the real humanity of Christ, be correct, how did he call Him a "divine man," a "heavenly man?" How did he say He had "a heavenly humanity," and was *conceived* by the Holy Ghost, when the Scripture expressly informs us He was *conceived* by Mary? How did he say, "Between humanity, as seen in the Lord Jesus Christ, and humanity, as seen in us, there could be no union. . . . The *spiritual* and the carnal—the *heavenly* and the earthly—could never combine?" How did he say that "Divine power was about to form a real man, . . . the

Lord from heaven?" How did he say that Christ was "a heavenly stranger—*entirely* heavenly?" On what grounds did he say that Satan was leading the professing Church astray on Christ's humanity? Why did he tell us that "the Lord Christ, God manifest in the flesh, the Lord of the Sabbath, the maker and sustainer of heaven and earth, spent the seventh day in the dark and silent tomb?" No sane man could possibly come to any other conclusion than that Mr. Mackintosh really believed Christ was, "*as to His manhood*, the Lord from heaven."

In order to test Mr. Mackintosh's present opinions, I once more "demand an explicit answer, yes or no, without any evasion, or 'guarding,' to the following questions:—Does he now *deny* that Christ, 'as to His manhood, was the Lord from heaven?' Does he now *deny* that Christ had a 'heavenly humanity?' Does he now *believe* that Christ appeared in *our* humanity? Does he now *believe* that Christ was made under the law? Will he positively declare that his opinions regarding the humanity of Christ are precisely the same as those which are held by the Established Church, the Presbyterians, the Methodists, the Baptists, the Independents, and the Covenanters?" I put these questions in a previous edition; but Mr. M. has not found it convenient to answer them. He knows, as well as he is alive, that his views are not the same as those which are held by the Christians I

have mentioned. He knows he has charged the professing Christian Church with being led astray by Satan on the humanity of Christ. How, then, can we believe that he never meant to teach any other doctrine than the proper and real humanity of Christ, as held by the professing Christian Church? Impossible, utterly impossible!

Let us now take a peep at Mr. Mackintosh's confession, or recantation, from another point of view. Let us take it for granted he really sees *now* that he was astray, in almost every word, on the humanity of Christ, contained in his various works;—that he does not now believe that Christ, as to His manhood, was the Lord from heaven, was a divine man, a heavenly man, or had a heavenly humanity—in short, that his confession is to be understood in the ordinary and legitimate meaning of the words it contains, and that his opinions are now exactly the same as those held by the different Christian Churches—and what is the consequence? Simply this. He must now believe that his books and pamphlets contain a complete denial of the Christ of Scripture, the Saviour of sinners. The Christ described by the Unitarian has no power to save any one, because he is not truly God; the Christ described by Mr. Mackintosh could not make atonement for any man, because he had no real humanity. The works of the one deny the proper Godhead of Christ; the works of the other deny the proper

humanity of Christ, so that they are much on a par. Neither of them has a real Saviour. If Mr. Mackintosh's confession be true, he must see this. Why, then, does he still allow all the books which contain his heretical statements to circulate? Why will he spread the soul-destroying heresy? Seeing he has not burned the books, how are we to believe he has changed from the opinions they contain? If a confession of his crime was necessary *to satisfy his own conscience*, and had nothing to do with *appeasing other people*, on what principle can he continue to circulate his heretical writings? Above all, if his confession, or recantation, or whatever else he may choose to call it, was intended to have a real influence in correcting the evil which has been already done by the distribution of his heretical works, why has he not sent it to every journal, magazine, and newspaper in the empire, which would give it insertion? Why has he not used every effort to scatter the antidote as widely as he has scattered the poison? How does it come that the slips on which he has printed his confession are so few in number that they are more difficult to obtain than five-pound notes? How does it come that parties are writing to me, begging I will try to find a copy for them? How does it come that I could obtain only one copy for myself? How does it come that some parties, as I am informed in writing, have got the loan of the slip with the express stipulation that it would be

returned without being seen by any one else? How does it come that tracts against the righteousness of Christ can be circulated like hail in a shower, whilst Mr. Mackintosh's confession is hid? Under such circumstances, could any man believe that Mr. Mackintosh really holds the true and proper humanity of Christ? If he does, his credulity has banished his sense.

But Mr. Mackintosh says that at the request of a dear and venerable servant of Christ he corrected his error in the second edition of his book. As this point has been fully handled in an early portion of this work, I will not return to it. A perusal of the remarks I have already made will show at a glance that Mr. M. "guarded" his views from the observation of a careless reader, but never either corrected or expunged them. I have specially to request that my readers will turn back to, and carefully examine, pp. 17 to 29, as I do not wish to recapitulate their contents in this section.

"I ought to have *confessed* the mistake," says Mr. Mackintosh, "and should have done so in the preface to the second edition, had I been sufficiently self-emptying and careless of my reputation as a writer.' Just think of this! In his writings he has attempted to overturn the doctrine of the proper humanity of Christ, and consequently has denied the Saviour of sinners; and when his attention is called to the matter, he cannot bring himself to a confession of

guilt on account of the self-conceit which arises from his authorship!! His own reputation is of more importance than the honour of Christ! Wonderful! Wonderful!! Wonderful!!! Besides, he never attempted to confess till he found that his heretical opinions were fully exposed to the view of the Christian public by my pamphlet! Who thanks him for it then? No one but his own dupes.

MR. DARBY'S REPLIES.

IN his pamphlets called "Brethren and their Reviewers" and "Righteousness and Law," Mr. Darby refers to Mr. Ryan, Mr. Cox, *The Journal of Prophecy*, *The Christian Examiner*, the *London Record*, Mr. Trench, and Dr. Carson. I shall reply to my own part, and leave the others to look after themselves.

"The reader will judge," observes Mr. Darby, "whether these statements as to Christ, defended by journals and theological names, ought to be denounced or not." Will Mr. D. inform us how *names* could defend statements? He could hardly write one page with accuracy. And yet this is the man who is looked up to as the head of his sect, and who feels it necessary to come forth as the champion for Mr. Mackintosh, in place of trusting Mr. Mackintosh to speak for himself. Poor Mackintosh will be permitted to write

some soft-sounding twaddle ; but when it comes to a higher branch, such as criticism, he must stand aside, and allow Darby to come forth !

“Miss Adelaide Newton, who is, I trust, now in heaven,” says Mr. Darby, “but the character of whose piety on earth has been, I judge, most falsely estimated.” As I once read the life of Miss Adelaide Newton, I feel thoroughly indignant at these barbarous observations. Mr. Darby, in the well-known grossness of his nature, may foster a powerful antipathy to the name of Newton, and may hint his doubts (when a Plymouth only “*trusts*,” he more than doubts) about the piety and eternal safety of Miss Adelaide Newton, but I am convinced he is the only person who has read her life that does not feel *certain* she is now in glory. I envy not the mental condition of the man who could pen Mr. Darby’s most revolting observations. Verily his censure is the greatest praise.

“Mr. Mackintosh,” remarks Mr. Darby, “did overstep the bounds of Scripture statement. He used language open to attack ; and I have no doubt his mind, in opposing one extreme, had gone into the opposite. . . . He laid himself open to the attack that was made against him by language which, if it might be defended, at any rate gave occasion to those who sought occasion. . . . The charge against him was unfounded and unrighteous. . . . Had he held the doctrines imputed to him, I for one should have objected to

hold communion with him." Here is a pretty medley. Mr. Mackintosh overstepped the bounds of Scripture, allowed his mind to run from one extreme to another, and laid himself open to Dr. Carson's attack, by the language he used, but yet Dr. Carson's charge is unfounded and unrighteous!! Again, if Mr. Mackintosh had held the doctrines which his language conveyed, Mr. Darby would have refused him communion, and yet his language might be defended!! Such is the man who sets himself forth as a critic. He would not make a good shadow for a critic. Mr. Darby proceeds:—"The charge made against him was, denying the true humanity of the Lord Jesus as truly *born* of the Virgin Mary."—"Brethren and their Reviewers.") "The two points charged against Mr. Mackintosh were, that Christ's humanity came from heaven, and that it was not formed in, and *born of* the Virgin Mary."—"Righteousness and Law.") How does it come, Mr. Darby, that you knowingly make a false statement of the case in each of your pamphlets? Why do you slip in the word *born*? When your attention was drawn to its improper existence in your first pamphlet, why do you repeat it in your second? I did indeed charge Mr. Mackintosh with denying the *true humanity* of Christ, but I never charged him with denying that Christ was truly *born* of the Virgin, and you know that right well. Why, then, do you not make a fair statement of the case? You surely cannot

pretend that you are sufficiently stupid to misunderstand the following statements on the seventh page of the *first edition* of my pamphlet—"I never charged Mr. Mackintosh with denying that Christ was *born* of the Virgin, was composed of flesh and blood, and had a human body ; but I did charge him, that he calls this flesh and blood, this human body, 'the Lord from heaven,' the 'Divine man,' and the 'heavenly humanity ;' and, consequently, that he makes this flesh and blood, this human body, to be really and truly God. Hence, if this human body was truly God, although it was *born* of the Virgin, it was not *made* of her substance. This is my charge." Will you acknowledge, Mr. Darby, that you misunderstood that? If you do, I will forgive your misrepresentation of my views, *as I would not then hold you as a responsible being.* But if you did not misunderstand me, on what principle do you feel called on to misrepresent me?

"But I think," observes Mr. Darby, "Mr. Mackintosh's expression objectionable. 'The second Man was, as to His manhood, the Lord from heaven.' The objectionableness lies in this, that, in ascribing the title of the Lord from heaven, it goes beyond ascribing it to His person, being man, and by the expression 'as to' separates the nature and ascribes the title to it." What does he mean? I would like to see the man who could write a more thoroughly incomprehensible sen-

tence than this. "Had he said," continues Mr. D., "He was Lord from heaven *in* His manhood, he would have been perfectly right, and he who denied it would be unquestionably a heretic, but 'as to' separates the manhood, and thus the words cannot refer to His person who was there in manhood. Dr. C. does not see the difference, and quotes them as '*in* His manhood,' condemning them alike as the same." Yes, Mr. Darby, and notwithstanding your remarks, I still consider them equally objectionable, and if you had one particle of perspicacity, you would be of the same opinion. Let us try these principles of criticism on another point about which there can be no quibbling. According to Mr. Darby's plan of reasoning, the man who would say that Christ *in* His divine nature was God would be right, but the person who would say He was God *as to* His divine nature would be wrong. Now, if He is God *in* His divine nature, He is surely God *as to* His divine nature. To suppose that the words "as to" would destroy His divinity is absurd. And it is equally ridiculous to imagine that it makes any difference whether we use the expression, "*as to* His manhood, He was the Lord from heaven," or "*in* His manhood, He was the Lord from heaven." He was not God either *in* His manhood, or *as to* His manhood. But Mr. Darby may, perhaps, in his miserably dark sentence have a special object in view in making the distinction which he

attempts. He does not say that the *body* of Christ, separately considered, is God, but he probably holds that the divine nature and the human nature are so united that they form an amalgam which is God. The two natures are fused into each other in such a way that they form a being *entirely* divine. This would be as decided a heresy as Mr. Mackintosh's. Christ was perfect man and perfect God: but He was not God in His manhood, nor man in His Godhead; nor was He an amalgam of two natures fused into one. His divinity and humanity were united, but the one was not lost in the other. The union did not make His humanity divine. There is another and more jesuitical view, which, perhaps, may have been before Mr. Darby's mind. In place of using the language as ordinary mortals would do, when he says, "The second Man was, *in* His manhood, the Lord from heaven," he may have meant that the divinity was enclosed, as it were, in His humanity. He may have had this sort of jesuitical reserve in his own mind, but it is not an honest way of putting the case. An honest writer would make a point to lay down all his positions so plainly, simply, and fairly, that it would be next to impossible to misunderstand his intentions; but it is a regular characteristic of the Darbyite Plymouths that their writings are frequently capable of a double meaning, and that their language will be understood by those who are initiated into

their system in a totally different manner from what it is by the public. It is this plan of jesuitical "guarding" which makes it so distressing to have anything to do with them. Their whole system is one mass of deception; and they are quite right in denying the moral law as the rule of their life.

"That Mr. Mackintosh ever asserted," says Mr. Darby, "that His manhood came down from heaven, is, as far as I can discern, simply a false accusation." If anything from a Darbyite Plymouth could astonish me, this certainly would do it. Mr. Mackintosh said, Christ, "*as to His manhood*, was the Lord from heaven," and that He had a "heavenly humanity," was a "heavenly man," and was "*entirely* heavenly;" and after all this we are told he never asserted that His manhood came down from heaven! I would recommend Mr. Darby at once to have recourse to the short and easy method of swearing that the black crow is white. There is little use in reasoning with men who will make such reckless statements. "The second Man," he proceeds, "was the Lord from heaven. That Scripture states." Precisely so, Mr. D. That is what the Scripture states, but you know right well it is not what Mr. Mackintosh states, for he has added to the Scripture, and tells us "*the second Man, as to His manhood*, was the Lord from heaven." Mr. Darby, however, says the Scripture "goes a great deal farther (in predicating of the nature what belongs to the person) than the ignor-

ance of Dr. Carson seems to be aware of." He then proceeds to comment on the sixth of John. As I have already carefully examined this portion of Scripture at pages 27-31 of my work on "Transubstantiation," in reply to the Rev. Dr. Cahill, I will not return to it here. Mr. Darby had better shake hands with Dr. Cahill over this subject, as their views appear to be closely allied. Still, in passing, I must call attention to Mr. Darby's characteristic inconsistency of opinion. He says, "The true humanity of Jesus is fundamental; but he who would so separate the natures [the human and the divine] in the person as to touch such expressions as the sixth of John gives, is on very slippery ground. The bread came down from heaven, and the bread was His flesh." Now, if there be any meaning in words, Mr. Darby here teaches that the humanity and the divinity were so united in Christ, that they cannot safely be separated in expounding the sixth of John; and also that the bread which came down from heaven was literally bread, and the flesh was literally flesh, and that the literal bread was literal flesh, and the literal flesh was literal bread! That this is fairly his nonsensical version of the case is rendered certain by a previous sentence, in which he says, "This union is so true, that He speaks of Himself as the living bread which *came down from heaven*, and declares that this bread is *His flesh*." The italics here are Mr. Darby's, and they point out his

specific meaning. Now, if it was *literally* Christ's *flesh* which came down from heaven, the flesh was literally bread, and the bread was literally flesh, and it was equally true that the flesh was *literally* to be eaten, and that the cannibals who would eat it were *literally* to have their *natural* lives prolonged throughout all eternity. Not only so, but on Mr. Darby's view of the case, Christ had no humanity at all from the Virgin—He had no humanity like *ours*—His *flesh* came down from heaven. "Hence," says Mr. Darby, "as mere human expressions, the divine man and the heavenly man can be used as expressing what is blessedly true, though they may not have the accuracy of Scripture." I seriously ask my readers, have they any doubt that Mr. Darby is as great a heretic as Mr. Mackintosh? If they have, I will give them another idea. Mr. Darby says Christ's flesh came down from heaven, and that the divine and human natures are so united that they cannot be separated, without entering on slippery ground, in the sixth of John; and Mr. Mackintosh holds such an idea about divine humanity, that, even after the crucifixion, he tells us that "the Lord Christ, God manifest in the flesh, the Lord of the Sabbath, the maker and sustainer of heaven and earth, spent the seventh day in the dark and silent tomb." Verily, a more decided pair of heretics never trod the earth. But after all his argument, in proof of the point that Christ's "flesh came down from heaven," Mr. Darby

tells us "it would be wrong to say His flesh came down from heaven." Darby! Darby!! Darby!!! In one sentence, he teaches that the flesh came down from heaven, and in the very next sentence, he says it would be wrong to say so!! How would it be wrong to say so, Mr. Darby, if your literal interpretation of the sixth of John, in regard to Christ's flesh, be correct, and if it be true that the humanity and divinity of Christ are so united that they cannot be safely separated in the sixth of John? Impossible. You have plainly taught, at least as plainly as you are capable of teaching anything, that the humanity of Christ came down from heaven, and therefore you should honestly stand by it. But notwithstanding all your inspiration, rather than follow your literal version of the sixth of John, I will rest satisfied with the version of it which is given by Christ Himself at the 63d verse—"The words that I speak unto you *they are spirit* and they are life." Mr. Darby's predecessors, the Jews, adopted the literal interpretation, and asked, "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" But Christ left them without excuse, for He told them, and His disciples, that His words were *spirit* and life; and, consequently, were not to be understood after the Darbyite fashion.

"But Mr. Mackintosh," says Mr. Darby, "did overstep the bounds of Scripture statement. He used language open to attack, and I have no doubt his mind, in opposing one extreme, had gone into the

opposite. To have stated the opposite to what he said would have been equally false.”—(“Righteousness and Law.”) Let us look at this. It would be false, according to Mr. Darby, to state the opposite of what Mr. Mackintosh said regarding the humanity of Christ. Now, what did Mr. Mackintosh say? He said Christ was a divine man, had a heavenly humanity, was entirely heavenly, and, as to His manhood, was the Lord from heaven. Mr. Darby, however, coolly informs us that the opposite of this would be false, or, in other words, that it would be false to say that Christ, in place of being a divine man, had a real humanity; in place of having a heavenly humanity, had a humanity formed on earth; in place of being entirely heavenly, was partly of earth; in place of being the Lord from heaven as to His manhood, was man as to His manhood. This is the plain English of the matter, and yet Mr. Darby would have us believe he is no heretic! His statement here, coupled with his interpretation of the sixth of John, places his heretical views beyond question. He says in regard to the humanity and divinity of Christ, that they cannot safely be separated in the sixth of John—“He who would so separate the natures in the person as to touch such expressions as the sixth of John gives, is on very slippery ground.” Let us keep this in view, and connect it with the previous sentence, in which he informs us that “this union [of the two natures] is so true, that Christ speaks of Him-

self as the living bread which *came down from heaven*, and declares that this bread is *His flesh*. Hence, as mere human expressions, the divine man and the heavenly man can be used as expressing what is blessedly true, though they may not have the accuracy of Scripture." What could be plainer than this? The human nature of Christ is so united to His divinity, that they cannot be separated. He is truly a divine man; and the living bread which came down from heaven is really His flesh. Consequently His humanity must have come down from heaven, and could not have been formed on earth; He was, as Mr. Mackintosh says, entirely heavenly. His flesh having come from heaven, could not have been formed in the Virgin. Let Mr. Darby say what else he may, this is the inevitable result of his own principles. If the humanity was formed on earth, and did not come from heaven, his line of argument would be childishly absurd. I have not the slightest doubt that Mr. Darby and Mr. Mackintosh both hold the heavenly humanity theory so decidedly, that they would never have made any attempt even to "guard," or, in other words, jesuitically cloak it, if it had not been that my exposure of their heresies marred their progress in the world. This is perfectly evident from their own conduct. At the 50th page of his "Righteousness and Law," Mr Darby, in specially referring to this portion of Mr. Mackintosh's work, says, "When first it was shown to myself, before

it was publicly in question, *it was in manuscript*, with an answer by another person. I replied to an inquiry on it. Both have gone beyond Scripture ; but I do not believe either meant anything wrong." From this it is as plain as possible that the subject was fully discussed amongst the Darbyites themselves ; and also that the controverted point was referred to the decision of the infallible *Judge Darby* whilst the work was still in manuscript. The publication of it, under these circumstances, proves that Mr. Mackintosh held the heavenly humanity theory as a settled and deliberate opinion ; and also that Mr. Darby did not consider he meant anything wrong. But Mr. Mackintosh, in his letter to the *Coleraine Chronicle*, says, "I grant you that had I anticipated controversy, I would have guarded the sentence of which Dr. Carson makes such a mountain." Now, what are we to think of this? Where was the controversy to come from? Mr. Darby has let us into a secret. The opinion was *already controverted*, whilst the work was in manuscript, by some of the Plymouths, and the matter had to be settled by *Judge Darby*, whose decision, of course, as the decision of an autocrat, must silence in future all controversy on the part of his followers. For the initiated, it did not now require to be guarded. The heterodox opinion might possibly be slipped in on the public without their being aware of it. In this way it would gain currency. But the moment I appeared on

the scene, the matter was entirely changed. It then became absolutely necessary to "guard" the sentiments, in order that the Christian public might not be deterred from the sect. The squeeze from without produced an effect which could not be accomplished by the discussion which was placed before Darby in manuscript. Such is Plymouthism !

In his letter to the *Church Observer*, published in Canada in 1868, Mr. Darby says, "I repeat, charging Mr. Mackintosh with denying the true humanity of Christ is a foul falsehood ; and after the matter has been sifted, as it has, a disgrace to those only who bring the accusation, as in truth it always was." And in his Review of the Rev. Mr. Innes, published in Montreal, he also characterises this charge against Mr. Mackintosh as "a foul falsehood." As a matter of course, this charge is levelled against me. Mr. Darby thus in two of his Canadian publications charges my statement as a foul falsehood. Does he believe he is here stating the truth ? He does not. How am I to prove this ? Just out of his own mouth. In his "Righteousness and Law," Mr. Darby says, "Mr. Mackintosh did overstep the bounds of Scripture statement. He used language open to attack, and I have no doubt his mind in opposing one extreme had gone into the opposite. . . . Subsequently he published a declaration that he had made a wrong statement, and that it was to be condemned wherever it might be found. . . . I hold it a great mercy

that it was brought out to light. I have no doubt his mind had overstepped the bounds of Scripture. . . . Mr. Mackintosh is, of course, bound in the Lord to do all needed to remove any evil flowing from his words." It must be evident to every person who reads these extracts that Mr. Darby's statements are as opposite as the poles. It is distressing beyond measure to have to deal with such a man !

Mr. Darby finds great fault with me for saying it is a contradiction in terms to call Christ "Lord as to His manhood," and also for making the statement that, "regarding the divinity of Christ, there are plenty of proofs that He is the Lord from heaven ; but regarding His manhood, we are plainly told He was made of the seed of David according to the flesh." As the discussion of this point would be foreign to my present purpose, I shall content myself with pointing out the decidedly Socinian views which are held by Mr. Darby. Those who have a proper regard for the divinity of Christ will ask no more to satisfy their minds than a bare statement of Mr. Darby's Socinian opinions. "Lord," says he, "is often a clear testimony to the Deity of Christ, because it is used of Jehovah." This is all very well. Seeing it is used as a title of Jehovah, it must, of necessity, imply divinity. But I wish to know from Mr. Darby how the term Lord is applicable to the humanity of Christ, if it be "a clear testimony to His Deity." Again, if it is "a clear testimony to

His Deity," must the same term, when applied to Him, not always be a testimony to His Deity? How can the term Lord be a testimony to or a proof of His Deity at one time, and not be the same at another? Perhaps Mr. Darby would say it is settled by the context. If so, I reply, it is the context testifies to the Deity, and not the term Lord at all. On this view the term Lord could *never* be "a clear testimony to the Deity of Christ;" and could never be applied to Jehovah. It is thrown overboard altogether as a term implying divinity either in Father or Son. "The word Lord, in itself," continues Mr. Darby, "is not a proof of the divinity of Christ." If so, Mr. *Consistency* Darby, how is it "a clear testimony to His Deity?" In one sentence you tell us "the word Lord *is* often a clear testimony to the Deity of Christ," and in another you inform us "it is not a proof of the divinity of Christ." It is a proof, and still it is not a proof! Powerful reasoning! A certain sign of critical acumen in the man who speaks of Dr. Carson's "sheer ignorance" on the subject! The most ignorant school-boy in the country would be ashamed of such things as Mr. Darby writes. Can that man be considered fit to take care of himself, who tells us in the same paragraph that "Lord *is* often a clear testimony to the Deity of Christ;" "but the word 'Lord,' in itself, is not a proof of the divinity of Christ?" If men were to reason about worldly affairs as they often do on religious

matters, they would be placed under restraint without delay.

"To deny His Lordship as man," continues Mr. Darby, "and that *in a way in which it is impossible to apply it to His Godhead*, is to deny the first great truth promulgated as the foundation of Christianity. . . . 'God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.'" According to Mr. Darby, the term "Lord" applies here merely to the humanity of Christ, and "it is impossible to apply it to His Godhead." If this is not Socinianism, what is it? Those who wish to give Scripture a fair interpretation can have no difficulty here. The meaning of the passage hangs on the application of the word "made." How was Jesus *made* Lord after His crucifixion? Was He converted into something He was not previously? Certainly not. He was just *manifested* to be what He professed to be, the Lord Jesus Christ. He was not *made* the Lord Jesus Christ, but He was *proved* to be the Lord Jesus Christ, by His resurrection from the dead and His ascension to the throne of His power. Matthew informs us, "He charged His disciples that they should tell no man that He was Jesus the Christ;" and that He "charged them, saying, Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man be risen again from the dead." And we are told at a later period, that all the house of Israel are to be informed that "God hath made that same Jesus,

whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." When Christ was put to death, it was supposed He was never to be heard of again ; but it was proved, or manifested, by His resurrection from the grave, and by His ascension to the throne of His glory, that He really was what He professed to be, the Lord Jesus Christ, and the house of Israel was called on to take cognisance of the fact. If, as Mr. Darby teaches, Jesus was *made*, in the strict sense of that word, "both Lord and Christ" after His crucifixion, it is manifest—it is incontrovertible—that He never was either Lord or Christ before it. If He was Lord and Christ before it, He could not be *made*, in the strict sense of that word, Lord and Christ after it. Hence, on Mr. Darby's showing, we had no Lord or Christ till after the crucifixion, and even then the Lordship was a mere title conferred "*in a way in which it is impossible*," says Mr. Darby, "*to apply to His Godhead*." Are my readers prepared to swallow such sentiments? No Lord, no Christ, till after the crucifixion ! Verily, there is no end to Mr. Darby's dreadful opinions.

Mr. Darby proceeds : "The Lordship of Christ, as a *conferred* Lordship, the New Testament is full of. So it is said, 'To us there is but one God the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ.' 'Every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.'" Just think of this ! When we confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, and that there is one Lord Jesus

Christ, we are to understand, according to Mr. Darby, that this is a *conferred* Lordship. Of course, under these circumstances, we do not confess Him to be God at all. His Lordship is only conferred; it does not belong to Him as a matter of right; it does not mark Him as God, but applies to Him only as man. It is a mere conferred title. It is no evidence of divinity. I would as soon pray to the table I am writing on, as to the Christ represented by Mr. Darby. This may be the Plymouth Saviour; but He is not mine. My Saviour is Lord in His own right. His title is not by courtesy—is not conferred, but belongs to Him in virtue of His Godhead. Mr. Darby is even worse than Mr. Mackintosh. He says, “Christ *as man* was *made* Lord by God. That is not Godhead, I suppose.” Now, if the manhood of Christ was *made* Lord *exactly* after Mr. Darby’s idea of the expression, if we must admit “His Lordship *as man*, and that in a way in which it is *impossible to apply it to His Godhead*,” if the term “Lord” is only a *conferred* title, and if the second Man was the *Lord* from heaven, it must follow that the Lord from heaven was a mere man, and not God. So much for semi-Socinian Darby. And his views here are in perfect accordance with his Socinian translation of the New Testament, which I have referred to at the 37th page of this work.

Mr. Darby is in high dudgeon at me, for finding fault with Mr. Mackintosh for stating that the

humanity of Christ was conceived by the Holy Ghost. How does he meet me? By Scripture, of course. No such thing. Scripture does not always suit him. He threw Mr. Cox overboard with a notice of four lines, because his pamphlet contained human authorities. But when it suits his purpose, he ignores the Bible practically, and quotes human authorities against me. When it favours himself, human authorities are to be despised; and when it favours himself, human writings are to be brought forward. In arguing my point, I alleged no human authority; I appealed to the Bible alone. Why, then, does Mr. Darby not meet me with the words of inspiration? Just because he cannot. He has come up to the charge a second time on this point in his "Righteousness and Law." How does he meet it? He is just at the human authorities again. He dare not open the Bible, because he knows it is against him; and he is not honest enough to acknowledge the fact. Mr. Mackintosh has said most distinctly that the humanity of Christ was *conceived by* the Holy Ghost. Now, if the conception was by the Holy Ghost, it is self-evident it was not by the Virgin. On this view, the Virgin had nothing to do with the conception, and there was no real humanity. The Scripture, however, is very emphatic against this "heavenly humanity" view, for it says, in regard to the Virgin, "*Thou shalt conceive in thy womb.*" The Scripture and Mr. Mackintosh directly contradict each

other here. The testimony is so plain and incontrovertible, that Mr. Darby could not quote one word of Scripture against me ; and still he had not the manliness to acknowledge I was right and Mr. Mackintosh wrong.

"Such was the humanity of Christ," says Mr. Mackintosh, "that He could at any moment, so far as He was personally concerned, have returned to heaven, from whence He came, and to which He belonged." Mr. Darby disputes the construction I put on this sentence. I stated that this asserts that the humanity of Christ could return to heaven whence it came ; but Mr. Darby says there is not a word of the kind in it. "It is said," he observes, "not *it*, but *He* had come, *He* belonged, and *He* could return. . . . I suppose Christ belonged to heaven, that He had come from it, at least He says so." Yes, Christ undoubtedly says so ; but He does not say, with Mr. Mackintosh, "Such was *My humanity* that I could return to heaven." Christ makes no such statement ; and this makes all the difference. If I say, such was the *divinity* of Christ that He could return to heaven whence He came, do I not assert that His divinity came from heaven ? Most certainly I do. And when Mr. Mackintosh says, "Such was the *humanity* of Christ that He could return to heaven from whence He came," does he not assert that the humanity came from heaven ? Most certainly he does. That this was Mr.

Mackintosh's view is rendered further evident by the expressions, "*divine man*," "*heavenly man*," "*entirely heavenly*," "*heavenly humanity*," "*as to His manhood*," "He was the Lord from heaven," "Divine power was about to *form a real man,—the Lord from heaven*," "the Lord Christ, God manifest in the flesh, the maker and sustainer of heaven and earth, spent the seventh day in the dark and silent tomb." Just think of the recklessness of the man who, after all this, asserts that Mr. Mackintosh did not say the humanity came from heaven!

"Dr. Carson," says Mr. Darby, "complains that it is asserted that 'there could be no union between humanity as seen in Christ, and humanity as seen in us. At this side of death there could be no union between Christ and His people.'" *You know right well*, Mr. Darby, I made no such complaint. The question of the union of Christ and His people did not *then* lie before me, and I neither complained about it nor entered on it. The question I had to deal with was Mr. Mackintosh's view about the "*heavenly humanity*," and to that I confined myself, and proved that he held it by the following words:—"Between humanity, as seen in the Lord Jesus Christ, and humanity as seen in us, there could be no union. The spiritual and the carnal—the heavenly and the earthly—could never combine." No words could more plainly assert that our humanity is *carnal* and *earthly*,

and that Christ's humanity differs from it in the fact that, in place of being *carnal* and *earthly*, it is *spiritual* and *heavenly*. Consequently, the humanity of Christ could not, by any possibility, on Mr. Mackintosh's view, be *real* humanity at all. It was in no way allied to us. It was not our humanity. It was not flesh, but spirit ; it was not of earth, but from heaven. In place of meeting me honestly on this point, Mr. Darby slides off to the consideration of *the time* at which Christ and His people were united—a question, which, however important in itself, was not then in discussion. By this means he tries to evade a point he knows he cannot meet—the *spiritual* and *heavenly* humanity of Christ. Shame ! Shame !

Regarding the union of Christ and His people, I may make a remark here. Mr. Darby says, "Christ was not united to man in the flesh ; but believers are united to Him by the Spirit when He had accomplished His work and taken His place on high as the glorified man, the head, and thus became members of His body. They were not members of His body as living on earth, but as exalted to heaven. . . . They are united to Him as risen and gone on high after His accomplished work, by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. . . . The union of saints with Christ is with Christ glorified, by the Holy Ghost, but not otherwise. . . . It is vital in these days to hold this fast ;" and Mr. Mackintosh says, "At this side of death,

there could be no union between Christ and His people." According to these statements, there was no union between Christ and His people until after His resurrection ; they were one with Him only after He had accomplished His work and taken His place on high as the glorified man ; it was only as risen they were one with Him ; there was no union, or oneness, until He ascended on high. Now, what is the result of these sentiments ? Simply a subversion of the foundations of Christianity. On these principles, the believer had no union with Christ in the obedience of His life, in His work on the cross, in His death, in His burial, and I might also say, in His resurrection ; because Mr. Darby positively asserts that it was "when exalted to God's right hand," that "saints are united to Christ," and this places the union beyond the period of the resurrection. Most soul-destroying doctrine ! It directly contradicts the apostle when he says, "I am crucified with Christ. . . . We are buried with Him by baptism into death. . . . If we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him. . . . We are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones." The Apostle Paul thought the Christian was so completely united to Christ before His ascension to heaven, that he was actually crucified with Him, died with Him, and was buried with Him ; but the Apostle Darby knows much better how the matter stands, and is able to tell us, by virtue of his

inspiration, that there was no union whatever until after Christ's ascension into heaven. Paul also made another great mistake, for he thought that "we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones ;" but the Apostle Darby has discovered that it should have been, "we are members of His *glorified* body, of His *glorified* flesh, and of His *glorified* bones !" The Apostle Darby has further given us new light of a very important nature, as I have already pointed out at page 281, concerning the conferred Lordship of Jesus. He has shown that there was no Christ on this side the grave for His people to be united to. Peter was commended for saying, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God ;" but if the Apostle Darby had been there he would have reproved him sharply for such a statement. Darby knows that Jesus was not then the Christ, because He was to be *made*, in the strict sense of that word, both Lord and Christ after His crucifixion. As a matter of course, then, it is incontrovertibly manifest that there was no Lord, no Christ, previous to the crucifixion, for any person to be united to. Christ was yet to be *made*. Truly, Darbyism, in one way or other, so far from being what Mrs. Guinness represents it, is subversive of nearly every doctrine of Christianity. "Oh ! but," Mr. Darby will perhaps say of himself, as he did of Mr. Mackintosh on another subject, "the charge of no union with Christ till after the resurrection is an unfounded calumny, as

it is acknowledged on the next page, that 'we are crucified with Christ !' " Your acknowledgment, Mr. Darby, is not worth a straw, because the truth of the thing acknowledged is rendered utterly impossible on the principles which you advocate—of there being no union with Christ "until He has accomplished His work, and taken His place on high as the glorified man." If there be no union till after His ascension into glory, as a matter of necessity the believer could not live in His life, die in His death, be buried in His burial, and rise in His resurrection. This is a most dreadful heresy, and yet the doctrine is looked on as so very important that Mr. Darby considers the overturning of it would be "the destruction of true Christianity ;" and Mr. Mackintosh believes it a point "fraught with such momentous results," that, if it be touched, "the entire arch of Divine revelation is injured."

Mr. Darby's next paragraph is so full of contradictions that it proves its own paternity. His statements are so reckless that it is impossible to give him credit for any intention of making them accurate. He says, "All God's moral attributes are communicated to or conferred upon man. . . . And as to righteousness as an attribute this is equally true. . . . That which is an attribute, or was in God, may be imputed, taken abstractedly." There can be no doubt of its being here unquestionably stated that the moral attributes of God can be *conferred* upon man ; that the

attribute of righteousness can be *conferred* upon man ; and that an *attribute* of God can be *imputed*, taken abstractedly. This is all unquestionably stated. But yet, wonderful to relate, in the very same paragraph he says, "an attribute being imputed to us is simple nonsense, being a contradiction in terms, because an attribute is something which belongs to or is in the being spoken of, so as to be part of himself. . . . Nobody has said that the righteousness of God is imputed. . . . Nobody ever thought of imputing an attribute of God, or any attribute at all." I have here set Mr. Darby to contradict himself, and I would not like to spoil his reply to himself by any comments of mine. How far his conduct in relation to this matter may be consistent with his sanity, I leave his friends to decide. I strongly advise that a lunacy commission should be issued to inquire as to the development and health of those portions of his brain which have to do with the intellectual and moral faculties which render him an accountable being ; and, in the meantime, I request my readers to compare his statements here with the quotations and observations I have made at pp. 45 to 50 of this work.

"Dr. Carson's objection to this," says Mr. Darby, "makes me doubt whether he is a Christian at all." I can assure Mr. Darby that I am not the least concerned about his opinion on this point. I will value his opinion when I recognise him as a Christian, but not

till then. In fact, if he were to praise me as a Christian, I would be afraid the devil had me. I may well consider it a high honour to be abused by him, seeing that the sacredness of the grave could not protect the Christian character of Miss Adelaide Newton from his barbarous assaults. Whether or not I am a Christian is of overwhelming importance to myself, but it is of exceedingly little concern to the public; and therefore I am not going to dilate upon it. It is sufficient for myself that I know in whom I have believed. I will not trouble Mr. Darby by telling him what *I am*; but I will tell him what I am *not*. I am not one of those long-faced, sanctimonious parties who could declare that I had reprinted all the articles on a particular subject, at the very time that I was leaving the main, and most obnoxious, one out. I am not, and I trust I never will be, a Christian of this Darbyite description. I trust the Lord will always enable me to steer clear of such Christianity.

"Nobody has said," observes Mr. Darby, "that the righteousness of God is imputed." It is exceedingly disagreeable to have to deal with a man who is so regardless of what he states. Look here. "It is not the righteousness of God, a *fact, an existing thing*, which is spoken of," says Mr. Darby, "but righteousness of God — this *quality* of righteousness. . . . We have gained an immense point in understanding that God's righteousness is the *quality* or character that is *in* God

Himself.”—(“The Righteousness of God,” pp. 14 to 28.) “That, in the Old Testament, the Lord’s righteousness means a *quality* in the character of God, is beyond all question. Is it different wholly in the New? *I do not believe it.*”—(“Pauline Doctrine,” by Mr. Darby, p. 16.) “The righteousness of God,” says Mr. Stanley, “does not mean the righteousness of Christ.” “I read,” says Mr. Mackintosh, “of the righteousness of God, and, moreover, of the *imputation* of righteousness; but *never* of the righteousness of Christ.” “To the believer,” says Mr. Bell, “righteousness is *imputed* without works. How? Through the righteousness of Christ? The Scripture does not say so.” We have it here stated that the righteousness of God is the *quality*, or attribute, which is in God Himself; that the righteousness of God is not the righteousness of Christ; that righteousness is *imputed* to the believer, but the Scripture does not say through the righteousness of Christ; and that we read of the righteousness of God, and of the *imputation* of righteousness, but never of the righteousness of Christ; and consequently the righteousness which is *imputed*, not being the righteousness of Christ, must be the righteousness of God; and, after all, Mr. Darby tells us “nobody has said that the righteousness of God is imputed.” I ask, in amazement, what next? Fie! fie! Mr. Darby.

“A man who is a sinner is accounted righteous,” says Mr. Darby, “because of Christ and His work.” The

God of truth, it is plain, cannot account a man anything but what he is in reality and in truth. If God counts him righteous, he must be truly righteous in the sense in which God counts him so ; otherwise God is made the author of a falsehood. Again, if he is accounted righteous by God on the grounds of the work of Christ, the work of Christ must constitute a *perfect righteousness*—there must be nothing wanting. Not only so, but this very work of Christ, as I have pointed out at p. 54, would then be the righteousness of Christ, which the Darbyites so decidedly deny. But the work of Christ, *on Mr. Darby's view*, as I have already shown at pp. 45 to 60, which the reader will please refer to, could not possibly constitute a perfect righteousness. The man who is righteous is *innocent*, or *guiltless*. Suffering the punishment for the breach of the law can never bring innocence. Consequently, the sinner, who is already guilty, can never be made guiltless, or righteous, by the death of Christ alone, because that only pays the penalty. He requires a righteousness resulting from the obedience of Christ's life, in addition to the atonement effected by His death. The law must be kept, and the penalty suffered, in the room of the guilty, before innocence can result. The one is as necessary as the other. I observe that my views are incorrectly put on this point by the printing of the word "righteousness," in place of the word "obedience," at the 12th line of the 17th page of my first edition. Mr.

Darby makes Christ pay the penalty, but denies the obedience of His life for His people. Hence there is no complete righteousness at all to be either imputed or accounted. It is not a complete righteousness; it is only a part of it; consequently the God of truth cannot either impute or account it, in this condition, as a complete righteousness to any man. If God accounts a man righteous on account of the work of his Substitute, the work of his Substitute must constitute a perfect righteousness. God accounts things exactly as they are. He is no Darbyite. He is no deceiver. Mr. Darby makes the work of Christ a righteousness. So do I. Where, then, is the difference between us? Are our views the same? Most certainly not. He includes nothing in the work of Christ but His death; whereas I include everything in the work of Christ which He did and suffered, from the cradle to the grave, in the room and stead of His people. He makes the half of a righteousness equal to the whole; but I do not. He provides no complete righteousness for God to impute or account to His people; but I do. He has no real imputation at all; I have. He holds that a man is not truly righteous in himself, and that there is no real imputation of the righteousness of Christ to him. On this view, the man cannot be truly righteous at all, as he has not got it either in himself or his Substitute. I hold that a man is not truly righteous in himself; but that there is a

real imputation of the perfect righteousness of Christ to him ; and consequently that, when viewed in his Substitute, he is perfectly righteous—he is innocent. Mr. Darby's God is a deceiver, for he counts a man righteous who is not truly so in any view of the case ; but my God is the God of truth, for the man whom He counts righteous is perfectly righteous in the work of his Substitute.

“The essence of justification by faith,” says Mr. Darby, “is, that God justifies the ungodly. I suppose ungodly does not mean truly righteous. It is the ungodly whom God justifies.” What does he mean by this ? Does he mean that the person is ungodly in the *same view* in which he is justified ? If so, it proves that he knows nothing whatever of the nature of true Christianity. He is yet ignorant of a saving knowledge of the Gospel. And yet, if his words are honestly spoken, this must be his meaning. He makes God as bad as the devil. His God comes forth with a lie in his right hand, and declares a man just in the very same sense in which he is ungodly. Horrible ! Horrible ! The word “justify” means to clear. The man who is justified is cleared of guilt, is declared innocent, is pronounced righteous. Pardon is not justification. The man who on trial is proved guilty may be pardoned, but the pardon does not make him innocent. He is still guilty, though freed from punishment. But the man who on trial is proved to

be innocent is justified. He is not pardoned. He is declared innocent or guiltless. He is just, or righteous. He is justified, or cleared. The saved sinner is both pardoned and justified. Still, pardon and justification are not the same thing. The one forgives the guilt which is proved ; the other clears, or acquits, of all guilt. Such being the meaning of the term "to justify," how does God justify the ungodly ? I will lay it down as an incontrovertible principle, that the God of truth cannot justify any man, unless he is truly just : He cannot declare him to be clear of all guilt, unless he is innocent. To deny this principle, is to make God a liar. The man who says that God can declare a man innocent who is not truly innocent, blasphemes the Almighty. How, then, does God justify the ungodly ? Is the man ungodly in the same point of view in which he is justified ! Most certainly not. In one point of view he is ungodly ; in another point of view he is as pure and spotless as the throne of the Almighty. Looked on in himself, he is an ungodly creature, and requires pardon ; but when viewed in the face of Christ Jesus, he is perfectly innocent, or righteous, and is completely justified. In himself, he is condemned as a guilty sinner ; clothed in the righteousness of Christ, he is as pure as the Majesty of heaven. When viewed in himself, many things can be laid to his charge ; as he stands in Christ, he can exclaim, "Who shall lay anything to my

charge?" In Christ he is so truly innocent, that he cannot be truly *charged* with the slightest stain of guilt. This is a glorious view of the Gospel; but it is one which Mr. Darby does not understand. On his view of the work of Christ, no man could be justified. The sinner might be pardoned, but he could not be cleared; he might be forgiven, but he could *never* be justified. He might escape punishment, but he could never say, "Who shall lay anything to my charge?" When Mr. Darby excludes the obedience of Christ's life, and trusts alone to the suffering of the punishment in His death, he excludes the possibility of justification. His Gospel is only half a Gospel. It saves from punishment, but does not justify. On his view there is not a righteous man in heaven—it is peopled with guilty creatures. Such is the result of his denial of the righteousness of Christ, as resulting from His obedient life and atoning death. Not only so, but he expressly excludes all idea of innocence in the redeemed, in the following words, in reply to me on this point: "An innocent man," says he, "is a man who has never been guilty. And his ever *becoming* innocent, is simply nonsense." He here completely denies the possibility of innocence—the possibility of justification—the possibility of acquittal—the possibility of righteousness—the possibility of freedom from charge, or guilt; and in doing so, he evinces a lamentable want of discriminating power. His brain does not

appear to be able to perceive, that although a man who is guilty in *himself* can never be innocent in *himself*, it is quite possible for him to be innocent in his *Substitute*; that although, not truly innocent in himself, he may be truly innocent in another who has taken his place; that although, when viewed in himself, the saved sinner is full of wounds, and bruises, and putrefying sores, when clothed in the robe of Christ's righteousness he is so entirely innocent that even the eye of God cannot see either spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing. Mr. Darby is ignorant of the Gospel. According to his idea, there is not an innocent, or righteous, or guiltless, or justified man in heaven. He arrives at a pardon, but provides no justification.

"A man who has made debts," says Mr. Darby, "can never become a person who has never made any; but, if his debts are paid by another, he is free from the consequences of his folly." Here, again, we have a proof of great want of perspicacity—of thorough thick-headedness. It is, indeed, true that the person "who has made debts can never become a person who never made any;" but it does not follow from this that he may not be cleared of all debt by the act of another. Being a pauper himself, he can never get rid of the debt by his own works, but he may be completely cleared of it by the act of a friend. It is also true that, "if his debts are paid by another, he is

free from the consequences of his folly;" but the matter does not stop here. He is not only freed from the consequences of his debt, but he is also freed from the debt itself. He does not owe one farthing. In place of stopping short, as Mr. Darby would have it, with merely defying the jailer, he can shout, "I am free, I am clear!" If Mr. Darby were possessed of discriminating powers, he would see that his illustration is not altogether one in point. Sin is not merely a debt, it is a crime. The man to whom the debt is due *must*, in justice, take payment from any person who will give it; and the moment payment is effected, the original debtor is cleared both of the debt and its consequences. The case, however, is very different with crime. The king is not bound by justice to accept of a substitute for the criminal; and even if he did accept of the substitute, and thus allow the original to get rid of the punishment, he would not be clearing him of the guilt. Suffering the punishment, whether by the original or the substitute, will never bring innocence or clear of guilt. So is it with the work of Christ. On the Darbyite view, the punishment is endured by Christ, and the sinner escapes from hell, but no more; whereas on the Christian principle, the punishment is borne and the law is kept, and the sinner not only escapes from hell, but he is so thoroughly innocent, in his Substitute, that he can enter heaven, and dwell in the presence of a just and holy God.

"If only a man who was truly righteous was accounted righteous," observes Mr. Darby, "there would be no ground for imputed righteousness at all." It is difficult to know whether this observation arises from extreme stupidity or from an intention to mislead. Mr. Darby knows quite well that I do not hold that a man is truly righteous in himself, nor yet that, being once made truly righteous by having the righteousness of Christ imputed to him, he requires the righteousness of Christ to be imputed a *second* time. When the righteousness of Christ is really imputed to the sinner, who is never righteous in himself, he is then so really and truly righteous that God can treat him, count him, and look upon him as perfectly innocent. On Mr. Darby's principles, he is innocent neither in himself *nor his Substitute*: but the God of truth is compelled to act as a deceiver, and call him righteous, or account him righteous, when he is not truly and honestly so in any view of the case whatever !!

"The work of God in us is needed," says Mr. Darby, "that we may have a part in Divine righteousness." Now, what is this Divine righteousness in which we have a part? The Darbyites deny that Christ has worked out a righteousness for His people, and that there is such a thing in Scripture as the righteousness of Christ. Consequently, this cannot be the righteousness which Mr. Darby refers to. They do not affirm that the Father has worked out any righteousness for

the Church. Consequently Mr. Darby cannot mean a worked-out righteousness at all. What, then, is the Divine righteousness of which he speaks? We are compelled to come to the conclusion that it is an attribute of the Godhead. There is nothing else left which it could be. According to this, God is to divide His own attribute with us! There can be no mistake in the matter, for Mr. Darby says, "We may have *a part in* Divine righteousness." I must, therefore, call on Mr. Consistency Darby to reconcile his statement here with the one he made on his previous page,—that "an attribute being imputed to us is simply nonsense, being a contradiction in terms, because an attribute is something which belongs to, or is in, the being spoken of, so as to be a part of himself." I quite agree with Mr Darby that an attribute of God belongs to Him in such a sense that it is impossible for Him to part with it, and that to speak of its being imputed, or of man having a part in it, is the most perfect nonsense; but it is a specimen of nonsense which belongs especially to Mr. Darby and his followers. They do not require to take out a patent for this nonsense, as no person can successfully dispute their title to it. They ought to hold down their heads with shame on account of their absurd and contradictory statements. "Christ is righteousness," says Mr. Darby at page 18 of his "Righteousness and Law," "and it is imputed to us." What sense is there in this? What is imputed to us? He does not say

Christ has worked out a righteousness, and it is imputed to us. He does not say Christ possesses in His Godhead the attribute of righteousness, and it is imputed to us. But he says "Christ *is* righteousness, and it is imputed to us;" or, in correct language, Christ Himself is imputed to us. Could any specimen of greater absurdity than this be found? It is so absurd that it must be specially intended to deceive by the sound of words. It is easy to see that the work of Christ could be imputed to man; but no sane individual could imagine that Christ, in His Divinity and humanity, could be imputed to man. Hence I conclude that Mr. Darby, by the mere sound of words, intends to mislead the unwary. At the 21st page of the same pamphlet, Mr. Darby says, "Christ is our righteousness; and we have no other one, desire no other. And thus righteousness is imputed to us." Here, again, we have the same absurd sentiment. The righteousness which is imputed is Christ Himself, and no other *one*. "I have used 'Christ's righteousness' often myself," continues Mr. Darby, "as a general term, expressing Divine righteousness by Him, and I have no regret about it." Exactly so, Mr. Darby, you have done this, but in doing it, you have acted as dishonestly as it would be possible for you to do. An honest man always uses language in the sense in which he knows it will be understood by his readers, according to the fair acceptance of the words. But when

you speak of Christ being our righteousness, and of righteousness being imputed, and of Christ's righteousness, you must do it with the full intention of deceiving, because you know right well that you have a totally different meaning in your mind from the one which will be taken out of your language by the Christian public. This is just one of the most dreadful things connected with Darbyite Plymouthism, that the whole system is couched in the language of deception—is thoroughly “guarded.” It is this which makes it so difficult, and at the same time so very disagreeable, to deal with. There is no satisfaction in dealing with Jesuits. It must be confessed, however, that the Jesuitical plan is the only one that could suit their purpose ; because, if their doctrines were honestly told, the Christian public would fly from them with the greatest horror.

Mr. Darby proceeds—“Scripture never speaks of imputed righteousness at all, but of imputing righteousness, and the difference is very great indeed.” When Mr Darby is at a loss for a plan of relieving himself from a difficulty, he is first-rate at designing one. He should have been an architect, as he has great talent for invention. He has discovered that there is an immense difference between *imputed* righteousness and *imputing* righteousness,—so great a difference that the one is in Scripture, while the other is not. There certainly is this difference between the two, that imputed right-

eousness means the righteousness which God is imputing—the one involves the truth of the other. This is just the difference between them; but the distinction can serve no purpose to Mr. Darby. “Imputed righteousness,” says he, “is not found; but righteousness being imputed is found.” Let us see. Suppose God is *imputing* righteousness to His people, must there not be a righteousness to impute? To be sure there must. God cannot be imputing a thing which does not exist. Well, if there is a righteousness to be imputed, and if God is *imputing* that righteousness, is the righteousness He is imputing not an *imputed* righteousness the moment His people have received it? Most certainly it is. No man two degrees above idiocy could dispute it. And yet Mr. Darby tells us there is *imputing* righteousness, but no *imputed* righteousness in Scripture! “Because of Christ,” Mr. Darby continues, “God holds him relatively and judicially to be perfectly righteous according to his own divine estimate. *Righteousness is imputed to him.*” What! Can I believe my eyes? On the 18th page, Mr. Darby says, “Scripture never speaks of imputed righteousness at all;” and on the 19th page he tells us “righteousness is imputed” to man; and at the 55th page of “Righteousness and Law,” he says, “I believe in imputed righteousness with my whole soul in the true sense of the word.” It is really distressing to have to do with such an unprincipled opponent.

Mr. Darby asserts that "Scripture never says the righteousness of God is received by faith." Where will he go next? It used to be thought that those who receive, *by faith*, "abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ ;" but this it now appears is a great mistake. There is no faith at all connected with the reception of either grace or righteousness! At the rate Mr. Darby is sailing, he will soon be over all the seas in the world.

"The blood of Christ," says Mr. Darby, "does not make a man innocent ; it cleanses from sin and justifies him." It is quite true that the blood of Christ *alone* does not make a man innocent. Nothing can do that but the imputation of that righteousness which results from the obedient life and atoning death of our Saviour. This righteousness, however, Mr. Darby denies. Hence his system, which recognises *only* the death of Christ, contains no plan whatever by which a man can be presented before God in a state of innocence—pure and spotless. On Mr. Darby's own showing, even, there is not a man in heaven who is in any sense innocent or guiltless. As no man but an innocent man could truly say, "Who shall lay anything to my charge?" the Darbyites cannot honestly venture to use these words. They are not guiltless. As it would be nearly impossible, however, for Mr. Darby to write a consistent paragraph, he says the blood of

Christ does not make a man innocent, but, "it justifies him;" it makes him "guiltless." In other words, it justifies him, but it does not justify him; it makes him innocent, but it does not make him innocent; it makes him guiltless, but it does not make him guiltless. Pardon is not justification. The man who is justified is cleared; he is proved to be innocent—he is not forgiven; he is acquitted because he is not guilty. In whatever view a man is justified by the God of truth, he is cleared in the strictest sense of the word. He is declared to be just; and if he is declared, or viewed, or accounted just by God, just he must truly be in the aspect in which God looks upon him. He is not innocent, or just, in himself; but he is perfectly innocent, or just, when looked on through the robe of Christ's righteousness imputed to him. Mr. Darby is either ignorant of the meaning of the word "justify," or he uses it in a jesuitical way for the purpose of misleading his readers.

The same observations will apply to Mr. Darby's use of the word "impute." He says "righteousness being imputed is found in Scripture," but he denies that the man is clothed in the righteousness, that it is truly imputed to him, or placed on him. Hence he does not hold imputation at all. He should honestly give up the use of the word, and not be attempting to mislead the public by using it, with a mental reservation, in a different sense from what it really means.

The righteousness which is imputed to a man is *put on him*—he is clothed in it as in a robe. “That righteousness might be *imputed* unto them also. . . . He hath *clothed* me with the garments of salvation. He hath *covered* me with *the robe* of righteousness.” The Scripture recognises a true imputation, a real clothing, a genuine robe of righteousness, and a perfect covering. But on Mr. Darby’s system, there is no true *imputation*, no *robe of righteousness*, no real *clothing*, no true *covering*. In place of having a true righteousness really imputed, or put on, the man is *calculated* to be righteous, when he is not truly so in any sense of the word, and God is thus made the author of a falsehood. It is dreadful to think of such a system ! When the Holy Spirit says righteousness is imputed, He surely means what He says. He uses the word “impute” in its proper signification, and not in the Darbyite jesuitical sense. A genuine righteousness is really imputed to the believer, and, then, although guilty in himself, he is perfectly innocent, or righteous, as viewed in the robe of righteousness provided by his Substitute. According to the use which Mr. Darby tries to make of the word “impute,” there is no such thing as real imputation at all. He should cease to use the expression altogether. On his principles, there could be no proper imputation of the righteousness of Christ to the believer ; it is all mockery. Neither could there be any proper imputation of the sins of His people to

Christ on the cross. If the sins were not really put on Christ—if they were not imputed to Him—He did not die under them ; He must have committed suicide. For my part, I stand to the glorious old truth, that the righteousness of Christ is so imputed to the believer that, although guilty in himself, he is as innocent in Christ as if he never had sinned ; and also that the sins of the redeemed were so imputed to Christ that, although absolutely sinless in Himself, He became sin as the sinner's substitute. He was "made sin" for us ; He was "made a curse for us ;" He died under the punishment due to our sins. There was neither mockery nor suicide in this transaction.

In his "Righteousness and Law," Mr. Darby has returned to his floundering on this subject. "A great deal," he observes, "is said about being innocent. It is unfortunate when the whole argument depends upon what is not found in Scripture. . . . We must have Scripture, not theology." A person would imagine from this that Mr. D. was a great advocate for adducing evidence from Scripture. But a closer examination of his writings will demonstrate that this is all pure clap-trap. What Scripture did he adduce in support of Mr. Mackintosh's heresy concerning the conception by the Holy Ghost ? His Scripture consisted exclusively of human authorities—a thing which he very willingly resorts to when he is in trouble. It seems, however, he has a great objection to what

he calls "theology ;" or, in other words, reasoning on and from Scripture. This is a remarkably easy method of evading an argument on Scripture which, if he were to die for it, he could not meet. It is also a very wise thing for him to ignore reason, the first revelation which God gave to man, and the chief faculty by which man is to be able to judge of the very existence of either God or the Bible. He should at once join the Rev. Dr. Cahill in stating that "reason has no part at all in religion." At any rate, the less reason a man has, the better is he adapted for the reception of Darbyism. Mr. Darby proceeds, "God never declares a man innocent." If Mr. D. believes this statement, how has he the audacity to speak of a man being "*guiltless*," being *justified* before God, and of God holding him "to be a *righteous* man?" If God calls a man righteous, if He declares him to be guiltless, to be justified, He surely declares him to be innocent. God has not condescended to take a jesuitical lesson from Mr. Darby : He means what He says : the man whom He justifies is certainly innocent in the sense in which He justifies him. To speak of a man being justified without being declared innocent is something far worse than absurd, because it is using the word dishonestly—it is calling a man just, or innocent, or guiltless, when he is only pardoned. If this sort of jesuitical dealing be not stopped, it must be exposed to the gaze of all honest men. "The

Scripture," continues Mr. Darby, "never speaks of the righteousness of Christ." How, then, can Mr. Darby say he has "used 'Christ's righteousness' himself as a general term?" Why will he be so dishonest as to use an expression which he considers unscriptural, and which he could only use for the purpose of deception? It is truly dreadful to think of such conduct. "It is alleged," says Mr. Darby, "that pardon and righteousness are distinct." Yes, Mr. Darby, I have alleged that, and every man who has an atom of sense must see it to be true: and if you were to get the whole world for your trouble, you could not prove them to be the same. It is no wonder you dislike what you call "theology," or, in other words, reason brought to bear upon Scripture. No man possessed of the slightest portion of reason could join you in maintaining that the man who is only pardoned is perfectly righteous, perfectly guiltless, perfectly justified: and no man who believes in a God of truthfulness and honesty, could believe with you that God will account, hold, and declare a man to be truly just and righteous, when he is not either just or righteous in any sense of the word. No sensible man of the world will believe that the pardon of a criminal is the same thing as the not guilty of the jury. The one is forgiven though guilty; but the other is declared just, clear of guilt, innocent.

Mr. Darby has devoted several pages to the consideration of the question of law. I do not pretend to understand all he says, as he sometimes equals the real high Dutch, or genuine Chinese. He writes in the true Darby style; and he need never fear that any man will be able to plagiarise from him without being detected. I do not think there is a man in the world could equal him for muddiness. It is not my intention, however, to say much on the question of law here, as I have already introduced a section on the subject, which the reader can refer to. But I must draw attention to a few of Mr. Darby's statements. He says, "We are not under law at all. . . . People make this great mistake. Because the moral law is in itself good and perfect and holy, that, therefore, man is necessarily and always under it. This is not so." Mr. D. has gone aside from his usual course and made his statement plain. We cannot misunderstand him here. He explicitly states that we are under neither *the moral law* nor *any other law*. This is going it with a vengeance. He should burn the Bible forthwith, and ignore the necessity of a Saviour. He gives the one the flattest contradiction, and the other he makes useless. "We know," says the Scripture, "that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." We are here told that the law speaks to those who are

under it, and that the object of its so doing is, that *every* mouth may be stopped, and *all* the world may become guilty before God. Nothing can be more extensive than this. It includes the whole race of Adam. If *every* mouth is to be stopped, and *all* the world is to become guilty, there can be no one omitted. The Scripture is very specific. It does not say *the world*, but *all* the world and *every* mouth. No man can be exempted here. In his "Righteousness and Law," however, page 8, Mr. Darby says that this passage is confined to the Jews, and does not extend, *as it states*, to all the world ; and the inevitable consequence is that *some* mouths are not to be stopped, and *some* in the world are not to become *guilty* before God. As a matter of course, these parties have no need whatever for a Saviour. If they are not guilty, Christ has nothing to say to them. "They that be whole," says Jesus, "need not a physician, but they that are sick." Again, the Scripture informs us, "Where no law is, there is no transgression." From this, we learn most emphatically, that if any man exists who is not under law, he is no transgressor—he is no sinner—and requires no Saviour. Where there is no transgression, there is no room for an atonement, no need for a Saviour, and Christ is necessarily excluded. The Darby doctrine differs very far from Paul's. The apostle tells the Church at Rome that he "delights in the Law of God after the

inward man ;” and the Church at Corinth, that we are “*not without law to God, but under the law to Christ.*” Paul and Mr. Darby are at direct variance with each other. Which are we to follow? My lot is cast with Paul.

“Sin,” says Mr. Darby, “we are told, is the transgression of the law. Now, no one knowing Greek could cite this theological, but fatally unscriptural, translation. . . . Another passage quoted is : ‘under the law to Christ ;’ but neither here is the law spoken of at all.” Although I have read as much Greek, Latin, and Hebrew as served my own purpose, I do not pretend to Greek, Latin, and Hebrew scholarship. Am I, therefore, to accept of Mr. Darby’s pedantic assertions on different points of Greek criticism? By no means. He is one of the last men in the world I would follow on a matter of the kind, for the simple reason that his organ of conscientiousness is not sufficiently developed to justify me in depending on him ; and in the next place, his brain is so coarse in its structural development that he could never become a really accurate and thorough critic. His powers of accurate discrimination are of a low order, and his talent consists chiefly of mere brute-force. Real critical acumen is beyond his measure ; and this will be seen hereafter when the influence of his personal physical force shall have ceased to operate. Even the very question at present under consideration would prove Mr. Darby to be void of

critical power. He places great importance on changing the translation from "sin is the transgression of the law," to "sin is lawlessness." Now, what does he effect by this change? What do we understand by the expression "lawlessness"? When we speak of a man being a lawless character, do we not convey the idea that he is so completely reckless in his conduct that he breaks all the laws of his country without the least compunction, and thus becomes one of the greatest sinners against the law in the whole community? How, then, could this translation improve Mr. Darby's position? Impossible. Perhaps, however, he might say lawlessness means being without law of any kind—not liable to, or under law at all. If so, I reply, the case would then correspond with the position in which he places himself in regard to the law of God—not under law at all—not subject to it as a rule of life. What follows, then? Simply this: if sin be lawlessness in this sense, Mr. Darby, who denies that he is under the moral law or any other law, is one of the greatest sinners in the world, for the sole reason that he is utterly lawless. Further, if sin be lawlessness in this sense, the man who is not placed under law at all—who is lawless—is the only sinner in existence, because lawlessness is the very essence of sin; if to be freed from law is sin, the man who is placed under law ought to be clear of sin; and this gives the flat contradiction to the Scripture, which says, "Where no

law is, there is no transgression." So that, take it as you will, Mr. Darby's criticism on this point demonstrates that he has no claim whatever to the highest of all talents—that of a genuine critic.

"Christ," says Mr. Darby, "was made under the law, and kept it. But sinners had no connection with Him in this place. It was needed for His personal perfection, and God's glory." Now, you are at it, Mr. Darby, Christ did not require to keep the law as the sinner's substitute ; but *He required to keep it for His own personal perfection!* If the keeping of the law was necessary for His "personal perfection," He must have been personally imperfect without it. Nothing could be more horribly blasphemous than this statement of Mr. Darby's. It is truly awful. In his second reply, Mr. Darby tries to shuffle out of it as follows : "Certainly, if Christ was under the law and bound to keep it, He would not have been perfect if He had not kept it. Nothing can be more simple. . . . There is not a word to withdraw in it. If I had said, as Dr. Carson in the same sentence practically does, that Christ required to keep the law to become perfect as the sinner's substitute, it might have afforded a handle." Mr. Darby's doctrine and mine, when fairly put, are as opposite as the poles. He holds that Christ did not keep the law at all as the sinner's substitute, but that He kept it, *and was bound to keep it*, on His own account, and that it was

absolutely necessary for Him to do so in order to "His own *personal* perfection;" consequently the mere neglect or avoidance of a single jot of it, even although that jot might not be essentially moral in its own nature, would have rendered Christ *personally* imperfect. This is a most dreadful doctrine. It makes the *personal* perfection of Christ hang upon a contingency. My doctrine, however, is not open to any such accusation. Christ was personally perfect in every sense of the word. He did not require to fulfil the law on His own account, or for His own personal perfection; but as the sinner's substitute it was absolutely necessary for Him to do so. If He had not fulfilled it on every point, His substitution would not have been perfectly complete. The imperfection, however, would have applied solely and exclusively to His substitutionary position, and could not, as Mr. Darby maintains, have destroyed His *own personal* perfection. To render the matter a little plainer, I may apply the argument to Christ's position on the cross. When on the cross He required to pay the full penalty of all the sins of His people, in order to the complete perfection of His atonement—in order to the complete perfection of His substitutionary work; and if He had not done so, He would not have been a perfect substitute: but as regards His own personal position, the matter is entirely different. He was personally perfect, and, therefore,

did not require to make any atonement for Himself. If He had come down from the cross, His substitutionary work would have been imperfect; but He would not have been personally and naturally imperfect, and this makes all the difference in the world. He was made sin as the sinner's substitute; but He was not made sin on His own personal account. According to Mr. Darby's principle of reasoning, the slightest imperfection in the atonement, in place of making a substitutionary imperfection, would have rendered Christ imperfect in His own individual capacity—in His own special person. The argument is just as applicable to the death as to the life of Christ. In either case, it degrades the Saviour in a most blasphemous manner. It is truly dreadful to think of such opinions being promulgated under the pretence of Christianity.

"Righteousness," argues Mr. Darby, "does come by law, if it comes by its being kept." If Mr. Darby had a little more perspicacity, he would see that his own position differs very little from this—that on his own plan, righteousness does come by law, seeing that it comes by the penalty of the broken law being paid on the cross. As far as law is concerned, there is no difference in these two cases. They both equally imply subjection to law; and any objection which could be urged against the one view, could be equally urged against the other. In point of fact, Mr. Darby's

criticism is perfectly silly unless he is prepared to deny that righteousness can result in any sense from the work of Christ, either in keeping the law (as written on man's heart and revealed) in life, or in paying the penalty for the breach of the same in death. It is law all the while. "We are not justified by works of law," says Mr. Darby, "*by whomsoever done*, but entirely in another way. 'If righteousness comes by law, Christ is dead in vain.' . . . If we are righteous by Christ's keeping the law, it does come by the law, and Christ's death is in vain." Mr. D. here does all he can to mystify his readers by jumbling up the keeping of the law by the sinner on his own account, and the keeping of it by Christ on the sinner's behalf. The two things are as different as day is from night ; and if the proper distinction be observed, the whole affair becomes as simple as possible. On this plan, the different portions of Holy Writ can be fairly reconciled, in place of setting them to contradict each other, as they must do on Mr. Darby's principles. No interpretation can be right which makes one portion of Scripture contradict another. The Bible is the Word of God, and cannot be inconsistent with itself on any subject. Mr. Darby seems to be quite satisfied if he can only cover his opinions by the mere sound of Scripture, no matter what havoc he may thus make of Revelation. He acts like an infidel. "I know," says Job, "that I shall be justified." How

do you know that, Job? Is it not said, "In thy sight, O Lord, shall no man living be justified?" Do these two statements not contradict each other? No. They are both true, only in a different point of view. No man living shall be justified by his own works; but he may be justified by the righteousness of Christ. This is the key which unlocks the difficulty through which Mr. Darby is incapable of seeing. If righteousness comes by law, or, in other words, if a man attempts to procure righteousness by obeying the law on his own account, then, indeed, Christ is dead in vain as far as he is concerned. He repudiates the righteousness of Christ and tries to work out a righteousness for himself. By undertaking to obey the law himself, he ignores the necessity of a Saviour as much as the Darbyites, who say they are not under law. The one undertakes to keep the law, and the other denies he is under it. On such a plan, neither of them requires a Saviour, and Christ is dead in vain. The Scripture, however, takes a more satisfactory view of this matter. It represents the utter inability of man to keep the law he is under; but it does not thus leave him hopeless, as it points out a perfect way of escape through the work of a substitute, Christ Jesus. "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the

law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Here is the whole question in a few words. When we were unable, in consequence of the weakness of the flesh, to procure righteousness by our keeping of the law, God sent His Son in the likeness of our flesh, in order that *the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us*, through our law-keeping and sin-atonement substitute, Jesus Christ.

Although the question of Sanctification has not been directly mentioned in this controversy, I shall take the opportunity, because of the great importance of the subject, of introducing the opinions held by my father on the matter. So far as I am aware, he was the first to point out the distinction between the progressive sanctification in the Christian, and the perfect and complete and instantaneous sanctification in Christ. In his letter to my brother-in-law, dated, "Tubbermore, May 14th, 1836," he says in regard to 1 Cor. i 30, "The sanctification here spoken of appears not to be that which is wrought in us by the Holy Spirit, which is progressive and never perfect in this world. The sanctification here spoken of is that which *Christ is made* to us, and not that we are *made by Christ*. The sanctification of the Spirit is performed in us by the Spirit through the *word*. The sanctification spoken of in this passage we have not in our own persons, but in Christ, as one with Him by faith in His righteous-

ness through death. It is this that makes us fit to go to heaven the moment we believe in the Lord Jesus. We cannot enter heaven, but as having a *perfect holiness*, as well as a *perfect righteousness*. This we have in Christ: as we are one with Him, whatever is His is ours. To suppose that the sanctification here spoken of is that which is wrought in us, would oblige me to explain the *righteousness* and *redemption* here spoken of, as that which is in ourselves. For you may observe that Christ is said to be sanctification to us, just as He is redemption and righteousness. Now, if the sanctification which He is to us is that which is personally in us, then the righteousness spoken of is not that which we have in Christ, but that which Christ works in us—that is, inherent righteousness. But the righteousness which Christ is made to us is not the righteousness which He *works in us*, but which He has *wrought for us*. We have, then, righteousness in Him, and not in ourselves. In the same way with respect to redemption. Christ is made redemption to us by God, not by enabling us to redeem ourselves, but by Himself paying the price. If, then, the redemption here spoken of is not in us, neither is the sanctification. God does not enable us to work a righteousness to justify ourselves, nor to pay a price to redeem ourselves; but Christ is, of God, made to us both righteousness and redemption. . . . we have everything in Him. In short, this passage shows us how

the believer stands complete in Jesus Christ. Whatever the law demands of us, it has it on our account in Him. In this way the Christian stands perfect before God, while in another point of view he is utterly deficient. Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? Now, if we are considered as in ourselves, and not as we stand in Christ, as one with Him, there are a thousand things to be laid to our charge. . . . It may be laid to our charge that we are not perfectly holy: the answer is, Christ is our sanctification. This view, however, you will not find in any of the commentators. I mentioned it to Mr. Haldane when I saw him last summer, and he adopted it. It is quite evident that Christ is made the sanctification to us, just as He is made righteousness and redemption.—Most truly yours, ALEX. CARSON."

Mr. Darby is very kind to me on the subject of the Pastoral Office. He lets me off with a page, and then says he does "not purpose going farther into the question." Does any one know the reason why? Just because he cannot. My argument on the Pastoral Office is so exceedingly close to plain Scripture principles that it is perfectly impregnable. Mr. Darby's guns are not able to leave a mark on it. The Pastoral Office is one of the very first points on which the Darbyites ply the public; but here the leader is obliged to "sing dumb."

"I do not pretend," says Mr. Darby, "to answer all

the reasoning of Dr. Carson." You are quite right, Mr. Darby. There is no use in your pretending to a thing you cannot possibly accomplish. I have been honoured with a considerable number of favourable reviews ; but I consider Mr. Darby's the most favourable I have yet received. Many parties who speak well of my work agree with my own views ; but Mr. Darby's reviews are peculiarly favourable in this respect, that with the greatest wish to overturn my statements, the recognised champion of Darbyite Plymouthism has not been able to find the slightest flaw in one of them. I have come through the battle without a single scratch. I am perfectly invulnerable, because, and only because, my bulwarks are resting on the sure foundation of God's eternal truth.

THE END.

THE
FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF PHRENOLOGY
ARE
THE ONLY PRINCIPLES CAPABLE OF BEING RECONCILED
WITH
THE IMMATERIALITY AND IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.
BY JAMES C. L. CARSON, M.D.
LONDON: HOULSTON & SONS.

In this volume the author has taken up a position as startling as it is new; but it is a position which he has well pondered, and one on the absolute impregnability of which he is quite prepared to rest any reputation he may have yet gained in the field of literature or criticism. He has carried the battle right into the heart of the enemy's country without fear or dread, and, if his views be found to stand the test of strict investigation, it would be difficult to over-estimate their importance. His principles being admitted—and he believes no man living can overturn them—Phrenology, in place of being “implicit atheism—materialism,” as Sir William Hamilton has asserted, must then stand out in bold relief as the only system which could by any possibility be reconciled with the Immateriality and Immortality of the Soul. Not only so, but the system of metaphysics which is taught in our Colleges and Universities, and in which all our clergy are compelled to be indoctrinated, must be lowered from its present ostentatious position, because it is a system involving principles which necessarily end in materialism, and thus overturn the doctrine of our future existence. These are bold and serious statements, but they are statements which the author is not afraid to make in the face of all the critics in the world. He has *proved* that Phrenology, and Phrenology *alone*, is capable of being reconciled with the Immateriality and Immortality of the human soul.

CONTENTS.

PHRENOLOGY—THE RECEPTION OF TRUTH—PROGRESS OF PHRENOLOGY—UTILITY OF PHRENOLOGY—REPLY TO OBJECTIONS—IS THE BRAIN THE ORGAN OF THE MIND?—IS THE BRAIN A COMPOUND ORGAN?—INFLUENCE OF AGE—SIZE, POWER, AND ACTIVITY—TEMPERAMENT—HEALTH OF BRAIN—EFFECTS OF EXERCISE—THE BRAIN AND SKULL—ABSOLUTE AND RELATIVE SIZE OF BRAIN.

REVIEWS.

"We had come to the conclusion that Phrenology as a science (falsely so called) was extinct, except among the half-educated classes of the community. We wonder any man of sound sense can believe in the possibility of detecting character by means of an organ only very partially and indirectly manifested through its bony covering. . . . We shall not pretend to speak of conclusions, which to our mind must be foregone, considering the nature of the subject."—*Medical Times and Gazette*, London. [The forehead of Dr. Chalmers and the forehead of Mr. Joseph Hume, M. P., measured very nearly the same at the region of those organs which are connected with the practical concerns of life; but Dr. Chalmers' forehead measured more than one inch and a half larger than Mr. Hume's at the organ of Ideality, which has to do with the ideal, the sublime, and the beautiful. Now, when applied to the thickness of a man's lips, the size of his mouth, the length of his ears, or the turn-up at the point of his nose, one inch and a half might, perhaps, make a visible difference; but when applied to the organs of the brain, one inch and a half is such an imperceptible measurement that no "man of sound sense and high education," like the editor of *The Medical Times and Gazette*, could ever think of believing in less than three feet! Ha! Ha, Ha!! Ha, Ha, Ha!!!—J. C. L. CARSON.]

"We are convinced that few men *who have brains* will put down this work without feeling that Dr. C. has succeeded in proving that the Phrenologist, so far from being a materialist, is the only man who can properly and consistently avoid materialism. In the opening chapters the author points out the difficulties that Phrenology has had to labour under from the bigotry and blockheadedness of men, whose chief arguments consisted in sneers and jibes and wilful misrepresentations. For plain, all-convincing, argumentative power, and really interesting facts, the chapters on the brain the organ of the mind, and the brain a compound organ, cannot fail to please and instruct the careful and conscientious reader. The concluding chapters are as full of instruction as they are of scholarly lore. This work on Phrenology will hold fast for the author that fame which his learning, his argumentative powers, and above all, his bold unswerving close keeping to Bible teachings, have earned for the learned son of a learned father."—*Tyrone Constitution*.

"You meet with very great ability," says the Right Rev. Dr. Alexander, Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe, "the common objection that such a relationship between mind and matter, as Phrenology implies, would lead to materialism. The illustrative physiological anecdotes, &c., marshalled by a logical thinker like yourself, are interesting; and you write clearly and vigorously."—(Published, by permission, from a private letter.)

"We have derived both instruction and extreme gratification from Dr. Carson's able, instructive, and most attractive work. Our space unhappily prevents us from entering, as we should wish, into a review of the many interesting topics which our author has discussed in a charming style. A bare enumeration can afford no idea of the highly attractive style in which Dr. C. has treated the whole question, pressing into his service the choicest illustrations drawn from an immense range of professional and literary reading, and actually investing his disquisitions with all the lightness and engaging interest of a work of fancy, so judiciously have the popular and scientific elements been blended

together. In regard to the grand inquiry announced in the title-page, we are convinced that Dr. C. has demonstrated his position, that what are called mental diseases are in reality morbid disturbances of the brain alone, and that on this hypothesis only can the immateriality of the human soul be maintained. We repeat we have perused with the highest satisfaction this very interesting volume, and we commend it to the study of thoughtful readers, who will find it as engaging and entertaining as any novel, from the capital anecdotes and literary selections which Dr. C. has made so happily subservient to the great object of his researches."—*Derry Standard*. Edited by James M^c Knight, Esq., LL. D.

"The present volume discusses, with a clearness and power almost peculiar to the gifted author, some popular objections to Phrenology; and it would be difficult to find a more interesting and suggestive book. As a popular introduction to the study of Phrenology, it has no rival; and we commend it as by far the most argumentative and able book we have seen on the subject, and one which must attract attention from the higher class of minds."—*The Irish (Wesleyan) Evangelist*, Dublin.

"A very learned work, written with much force and after much research."—*Rev. C. H. Spurgeon's Sword and Trowel*.

"This is a work of great interest and merit, on a subject much talked of, but little really studied or understood. Dr. C. brings to bear upon his task the resources of a well-trained mind, a practised pen, and vast professional reading and experience. In this work he has fully carried our judgment, solved many of our doubts and difficulties, and imparted to us much interesting and valuable information. We heartily commend Dr. Carson's able, most interesting, instructive, and entertaining book."—*Western Star*, Ballinasloe.

"This is a pleasant volume by one of the most effective polemicists of our day. That there is a connection, close and intimate, between the powers of thought and the development of the brain is known by the millions who never question the grounds of their belief, as certainly as to the scientific few who have made it a subject of special attention and research. . . . Though Phrenology should be able to give us the original elements of a given mind, it can tell us nothing of the totality which these elements have combined to form, because it cannot decide upon the proportions in which they may have been united. This fact explains the slow progress of Phrenology in forcing its way into popular and practical recognition. The famous article by Lord Jeffrey, in the *Edinburgh Review*, even after all Dr. Carson has said against it with such ability and acuteness, is to our mind conclusive against the claims of Phrenology to take a place among the sciences."—*The Evangelical Witness and Presbyterian Review*. [First—the learned editor does not appear to be as near Lord Jeffrey as he imagines. The editor admits that the millions as well as the learned few know there is a direct relationship between the power of thought and the development of the brain, whereas Lord Jeffrey declares, "We have never yet known what it is to feel that we think by means of our brains. . . . There is not the smallest reason for supposing that the mind ever operates through the agency of any material organs, except in its perception of material objects, or in the movements of the body which it inhabits." Second—The metaphysicians, as rank materialists, may amuse themselves in dilating "on the elements of a given mind," in explaining "the totality which these elements have combined to form," and in deciding on "the proportions in which these elements are united;"

but the Phrenologist can afford to look upon the mind as simple, uncompounded, indivisible, immaterial and immortal.—J. C. L. CARSON.]

"This subject is learnedly discussed in a work recently published by Dr. Carson, the study of which we recommend to all who desire to have a clear notion of it. Spurzheim and others wrote on it; but the most conclusive reasoning ever we met is in Dr. Carson's able essay."—*Belfast News Letter*.

"We are sorry we cannot do justice to this work. It is impossible, even in outline, to give a digest of his arguments; but those who are interested in psychological and physiological studies should at once procure the book."—*Banner of Ulster*, Belfast.

"What a pity the author of this work is not a doctor of divinity. Here is an exhaustive treatise on a subject which years ago commanded general attention and animated controversy. It was stoutly affirmed, and by many steadfastly believed, that Phrenology had its roots in materialism, rendered morality circumstantial, and induced a state of hesitancy in the inspiration of Divine truth. This objection Dr. C. minutely examines, and by arguments, apparently complete, abundantly refutes. He goes even further, and successfully shows that Phrenology is the only basis upon which the immateriality of the soul can be upheld."—*The Voice of Truth*, London.

"The writer is a gentleman of acknowledged learning and great literary ability. We hope the work will lead Christian philosophers to think, and help them also to reason logically on one of the most profound subjects that can engage their attention."—*Baptist Messenger*, London.

"From the point of view adopted by the author, the work before us is well argued."—*Glasgow Daily Herald*.

"To say that Dr. Carson is the author of this work, is a sufficient guarantee that it is a vigorous, manly, and able treatise upon the subject to which it relates. A true Phrenology does not lead to materialism, but is its best scientific antidote. Any one who desires to see Phrenology and Revelation harmonised by a bold and fearless thinker should read this book. It is truly scientific, and, at the same time, pervaded by a spirit of deepest [reverence] for God's Word."—*Primitive Church Magazine*, London.

"This is really a wonderful book. Dr. Carson effects his purpose in language so lucid, by illustrations so vivid, and arguments so cogent, that he would be sceptical who would doubt, and a dunce who could not understand."—*Coleraine Chronicle*.

"We wish we had the power to convey the impression this book has made upon ourselves—that the Phrenologist is the only man who can avoid materialism. This is the theory with which Dr. Carson startles the thinking world; but if ever theory were made established fact, by philosophical considerations at once the most profound and lucidly transparent, this is what our author has, to his undying honour as an independent thinker, accomplished."—*Ballymoney Free Press*.

"There is a vigour and freshness of illustration, of anecdote, and of rejoinder in Dr. Carson's writing, which lays hold of the reader's attention, and fixes his mind without wearisome tension on the point under examination. His reasonings and illustrations on the reception of truth, the utility of Phrenology, and his replies to objections, are most

instructive reading, apart from the inquiry into the science under consideration. Those who have been shaken by the sciolism of the materialists, and perplexed by the sophistries of sceptics, will do well to read attentively these well-reasoned and lucid lectures on the truth of an unjustly censured science, and its perfect accordance with the eternal truths of revealed religion."—*The Morning Advertiser*, London. Edited by James Grant, Esq.

"To those who wish to master this important subject, the present work is invaluable. We give it our hearty recommendation. We think it the most valuable book ever written upon Phrenology. Dr. Carson fearlessly throws his whole soul into the subject, routs his antagonists, and takes all their strongholds."—*The Gospel Herald*, London.

"It is evident that Dr. Carson is a thoroughly honest believer in the theory he advances, and also that he has based it upon a very careful study of facts. His work is marked by much ability, and no one can but be the better for studying it."—*Aberdeen Free Press*.

"The title presents an argument of immense magnitude; and we fearlessly assert that none but drones and mindless persons will leave the book until they have inwardly digested the whole. Dr. Carson has done well to apply the lever of his mental and literary power to a subject (Phrenology) so likely to be beneficial to all classes; yea, to the whole world. Let his volumes on Phrenology and Capital Punishment become regular school-books, library-books, household-books. Let them be fully brought before the millions of the people, and something would be done towards turning this awful desert into a fruitful field."—*The Earthen Vessel*, London.

"Dr. Carson is a vigorous reasoner, with much of the force and clearness that distinguished his honoured father. He is also a master of the subject he discusses. The volume abounds in interesting facts, as well as in impressive argument; and is a welcome contribution to the science of the subject of which it treats."—*The Freeman*, London.

"Dr. Carson has collected a great mass of facts, evidences, and arguments to prove that Phrenology is true. What he brings forward includes substantially all that has been alleged in favour of Phrenology, and, perhaps, all that ever will be, and we can recommend this part of the work as a clear and able exposition of the position of the Phrenologists."—*The Daily Review*, Edinburgh.

"This is an important work on an important subject. Dr. Carson, from his anatomical knowledge, his scholarship, his acute and independent thinking, and his extensive reading, is qualified to discuss such subjects. We should add, too, that as he is a firm believer in Revelation, he is a safe guide in scientific inquiries. A glance at the heads in pages 455 to 459 should convince the most sceptical that Phrenology is not altogether a delusion. . . . On the whole, we have much pleasure in recommending his able work to intelligent readers. It is another proof of his own talents and great mental activity."—*The Sentinel*, Derry.

"Dr. Carson possesses a mind highly gifted and well stored. His powers of reasoning are of a high order, and he is manifestly imbued with a deep sense of the divine authority of the Sacred Scriptures. The statute-book of heaven is his ultimate source of appeal; and while he surveys with profound reverence the region of science, alike physical and mental, he subordinates all science to the inspired word. In this

treatise, he cuts away every inch of ground from the materialist and the free-thinker, and shows that the laws of our physical nature are in perfect harmony with the principles of divine Revelation. His chapter on the Reception of Truth is well conceived and admirably constructed. Such a work was wanted to take Phrenology out of the hands of mere empirics and dabblers in natural theology."—*Montreal Herald and Daily Gazette*, Montreal, Canada, Jan. 12, 1870.

"Phrenology has suffered from the character of its advocates in a greater degree than it has by the arguments of its opponents. It is, therefore, a satisfaction to have the question treated thoroughly—as in the volume before us—by a qualified writer (himself a medical man of large experience, and an orthodox Christian in belief), who lucidly sets forth what Phrenology really does assume to teach, and exposes the false issues that have been repeatedly urged against it. A book like the present, which argues out the question fully and fairly, is invaluable to those who desire to arrive at the truth in the matter. A lucid terseness, an absence of technical hindrances, and a substantial vigour in the treatment of the subject, will commend the volume to the interested reader."—*The Irish Times*, Dublin.

"Your name, on which your father shed such lustre, induced me to lay aside other works for yours, and its reasonings and many interesting facts led me on from page to page."—*Rev. Thos. Guthrie, D.D.*

The editor of the *Athenæum*, for reasons best known to himself, made a determined effort to injure Dr. Carson's book by the following criticism:—"If any kind of immortality is cultivated in his book, it is immortal hate. Thus, he says, 'the conduct of Cuvier was mean and disgusting in the extreme.' Sir D. Brewster's objections are 'childish,' 'trifling and miserably insignificant.' Another opponent blunders so 'that it is difficult to know whether he is naturally stupid or wilfully perverse.' A statement made by Baron Bramwell deserves 'something more than mere contempt; it is an outrage on common sense, and a disgrace to the bench.' Of Sir W. Hamilton, Dr. C. says, 'I hardly ever read so much trash, nonsense, and reckless assertion in the same bounds in the whole course of my life. I am surprised that Mr. Combe and Dr. Spurzheim were able to keep their temper with him.' Such surprise may be natural in Dr. Carson; but it is fatal to his reputation as a scientific writer. This is the more unfortunate, as Dr. C. is a man of ability, and could argue well if he could keep his temper." [Now, Dr. Carson freely admits that it is perfectly competent for a reviewer to find fault with the style of an author, provided he does it honestly and fairly; but he denies that in this instance there is one particle of honesty exhibited. A reviewer occupies a responsible position. He is bound, in honour, to make a fair statement of the case, in order that he may do full justice to the author on the one hand, and the public on the other. He must not swerve from the path of rectitude to please either side. If his criticisms are well founded, and fairly and honestly put before the public, the author has no right to complain, no matter how severe they may be. But, on the other hand, if through ill-nature, dishonesty of purpose, dislike to truth, or any other cause, he writes a shallow, ignorant, flippant, ill-digested, and completely one-sided review, whether favourable or unfavourable to the author, he is as mean and disreputable as the judge who would sit on the bench and deliver a completely partial and one-sided decision, on account of the bribe which he had dishonestly placed in his pocket. How, then, is it with the editor of the *Athenæum*? Has he acted fairly and honestly in the

matter? He has not. In place of quoting at full length the special points to which the language he complains of was applied, and thus putting the case fairly before his readers, in order that they might be able to judge between the parties, he makes a few garbled extracts, and thus distorts the case to suit his own malicious purposes. If he had placed the matter honestly before his readers, Dr. Carson would have been quite satisfied to leave the issue with the public. Take the cases, for example—Cuvier, in private society, expressed strong opinions in favour of Phrenology, but the moment he found that Bonaparte disapproved of his conduct, he “whirled,” and drew up a report directly against it. Was Dr. Carson not justified in saying it was mean and disgusting for a man in Cuvier’s position to change his opinions on science at the nod of an Emperor? The *Athenæum* says, No. A man is never to be called mean for “whirling” at the nod of an Emperor. It is evident that the editor of the *Athenæum* would “jump Jim Crow” morning, noon, and night, at the nod of an Emperor. Again, Mr. Stone “overturned” phrenology by the measurement of heads; but it, unfortunately, turns out that when his figures come to be examined by Mr. Combe, “the size of *three* organs exceeds that of the whole head which contains them, and all the other 32 organs have no size whatever.” If he had measured the remainder of the organs, in all probability he would have made the head a reasonable load for an ass’s cart. Was Dr. Carson justified in saying, “It is difficult to know whether this man is naturally stupid or wilfully perverse?” The *Athenæum* says, No. He is not to be called stupid or perverse. He is a genius of the first water. He would just suit to write reviews for the *Athenæum*. Baron Bramwell sentenced a madman to penal servitude for life, saying to the man, “That you are of unsound mind, I believe, but that is no reason why you should not be punished. I feel bound to sentence you to the same punishment as if you were sane. I am not sure that it is not more necessary to punish a madman than a sane one.” Is this barbarous statement not a disgrace to the bench, notwithstanding the opinion of the *Athenæum* to the contrary? When Sir William Hamilton denied the phrenological opinions regarding the *internal* condition of a cavity in the skull called the frontal sinus, Mr. Combe proposed to settle the question by sawing open a considerable number of skulls, so that the cavity might *be seen*; but Sir W. Hamilton refused to submit to this plain practical plan. He insisted on keeping the bones whole; and proposed to ascertain everything about the cavity by sticking pins into it!!! To men of sense, it may appear utterly incredible that Sir William Hamilton should have made such a proposition, but it is absolutely true; and the editor of the *Athenæum* has attempted to degrade Dr. Carson from the position of a scientific writer, because he has spoken in contempt of such a ridiculously silly mode of practical investigation. If Sir R. Murchison, the geologist, were about to inspect the internal condition of a cave, how would he proceed? Would he refuse to enter it? Would he commence to drill holes through the rock, that he might stick pins into the cave? If he acted on this grand Hamilton-*Athenæum* plan, how long would he be out of a lunatic asylum? Such a mode of investigation might suit the occupant (like Sir William Hamilton) of a Metaphysical Chair, where imagination, theory, and visions hold the sway, or it might be in exact accordance with the mental calibre of the editor of the *Athenæum*; but to men of good practical common sense, it must appear even worse than lunacy, because it involves an attempt to overturn and trample down truth by principles which must be known to be false the moment they are announced, by every man who is not an idiot. So much for the cases

which the *Athenæum* criticised, but was not honest enough to quote. The reader is now in a fair position to judge of the moral and intellectual development of the *Athenæum* reviewer of Dr. Carson's book. In the London *Lancet* of December 16th, 1876, there is an able article from the editor on the reprieve of the convict, Drant. If the learned editor, however, had been actuated by a wholesome dread of the *Athenæum* and Baron Bramwell, he would not have ventured on the following statement—"The scandal of hanging a sick man for a deed which was, in fact, a symptom of his disease, has been avoided; but the error of pronouncing the last sentence of the law in a case of madness has been committed, and justice is thereby disgraced. Justice is commonly represented blindfolded; but blind folly should not be one of her characteristics. The absurdity of proceeding to the end of a trial, and solemnly declaring the life of a lunatic forfeited, is, and always will be, a farce, and it is one which cannot be often repeated without detracting very seriously from the majesty of the criminal law. . . . The practice of *pardoning* a person for an offence he did not commit is silly enough; but the system which permits a man to be convicted and condemned when he is not in a condition to be guilty, and when his offence is plainly an accident of his disease, is something more than ridiculous—it is flagrantly amiss."—J. C. L. Carson.]

Third Edition, 2s. 6d.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IS MURDER LEGALIZED.

BY JAMES C. L. CARSON, M.D.

London: HOULSTON & SONS.

Those who are correctly informed on the matter are aware that capital punishment, under British rule, would end at once and for ever, if it were not for the support it receives from the religious community. It, therefore, behoves all Christians to examine the awfully serious position in which they are placed. If they have direct and unmistakable authority from God for choking a fellow-creature, they are quite right in doing it; but if no such authority exists, they are murderers of the deepest dye, when, in perfectly cold blood, they hurl the impenitent sinner into the abyss of Woe. Their position is a fearful one. Have they examined the matter carefully? They know they have not. Have they read with attention all that can be said on each side of the question? They know they have not. In perfect blindness, they have believed what they have been told, and taken the whole matter for granted. They would rather hang their fellow-sinners than take the trouble of a full investigation. Their responsibilities are terrible to think of. The great cause of crime of every description is, that there is no semblance of proper punishment for it in this generation. Many of those who oppose the death penalty, would put no suitable punishment in its

place, because they absurdly hold that human nature is too good to require it. The consequence is that they have left the people in an unprotected condition in those countries where the law has been changed. It is a great wonder things have not got worse, in place of better. The punishment for *every* crime should be such as to make the law a terror to evil-doers, and a protection to all who do well. One great objection to the death penalty is, that it is not by one hundredth part an adequate punishment for the murderer. Hanging would frighten the well-disposed, but it has not the least influence on the criminal class until *after* the commission of the crime. The evidence I have collected on this point is unanswerable. If the garotters had been hanged, garotting would never have ceased, but this crime was stamped out at once by the lash. The criminal has little fear of sudden death, as he says it is only a kick and a struggle and all is over; but he has a terrible fear of corporal punishment. Lashing one man through the streets of Dublin would have done more to stop murder than all the hanging they have done. Let the murderer be lashed once or twice every year during his life, and let the law be changed to the same thing in every such case, and murder would soon be a thing of the past. The punishment, too, should be administered in as public a way as it could possibly be done. This is the only way in which it could become an example. I have often wondered how men of sense could talk of hanging as an example,—as a great moral lesson,—so long as they are obliged to perform the deed of death behind a wall. It is perfectly ludicrous to talk of a grand moral lesson which must be hid from view, in order that the people may not be driven to crime by a visible example of the moral lesson. I wonder men are not ashamed of such opinions. There is so much sentimentalism abroad, that many parties will shudder at the idea of lashing a criminal; such a mode of punishment is considered far too hard-hearted. It will not be denied that the lash, freely administered once a year, would effectually stop crime; but our law-makers would rather allow the innocent to be murdered, than inflict pain on the back of the criminal. Murder *could* be punished by the lash, but never by the hangman. Hanging has so signally failed all over the world to prevent murder, that it is a perfect marvel that no nation, as yet, has tried the lash. If it had been tried in time, it would have saved America, and to the world, those noble-minded men, Lincoln, Garfield, and the Honourable George Brown. The culprit will make a great bluster about defying the hangman; but he would run into a mouse-hole, if it were possible, for fear of the lash.

REVIEWS.

“Dr. Carson, with great propriety, lays stress on the uncertainty of Circumstantial Evidence, of which he cites many never-to-be-forgotten illustrations. The proofs, as the reader of Dr. Carson's book may see, are frightfully abundant, that circumstances may be misinterpreted, and that their testimony may be insufficient, even when no one in Court doubts its meaning. This we admit to be in itself a very powerful argument. . . . All who know his previous productions will be prepared to find in this much keenness of perception and directness in

stating propositions, as well as acumen and force in defending them. In all these characteristics, Dr. Carson is very like his eminent father; and our readers need know no more than this to induce them to give their attention to this or any other production from his pen."—*The Freeman*, London.

"Dr. Carson's work deserves a careful perusal, because of the importance of the subject and the ability with which it is treated."—*Derry Sentinel*.

"Everything written by the learned and excellent author bears the impress of ability, reflective thought, and of extensive information."—*Derry Standard*.

"To those who desire to know all that can be said against Capital Punishment, we recommend this pungent volume. It ought to be read by all the friends of humanity, order, and religion. The chapter on the Scriptural Argument is especially able and trenchant. The work is written by one who evidently writes from earnest conviction, and with a sincere regard for the authority of Scripture. Dr. Carson's style is eminently lucid. He is as clear, concise, and forcible as his able father. When we find it impossible to agree with him, we are amazed at his forcible manner of expression. The opponents of Capital Punishment will do well to circulate this well-got-up book by hundreds of thousands. We predict it will pass through many editions."—*Baptist Messenger*, London.

"The author of a book with this strong title, to make good his assertion, must be a man of singular ability, and have very decided views on the subject. Dr. Carson did not essay a task too difficult for his exalted talents as a convincing writer on any subject to which he brings the force of his powerful intellect. He takes up, one after another, all the texts of Scripture which have been relied on as sanctioning the punishment of death, and with the hand of a master, while shirking no responsibility as a believer in the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, he shows, with the clearness of a sunbeam, that the genius and spirit of Christianity are totally opposed to the death penalty. He, however, does not content himself with the most luminous exposition of the meaning of the exact words used by the sacred writers, but with all the acumen of the most accomplished logician, he takes up the premises relied on by his opponents, and proves to a demonstration that the conclusions to which they arrive have been arrived at by wilfully ignoring facts, or by importing matters into the discussion which have nothing in the world to do with it."—*Ballymoney Free Press*.

"In the chapter on the Scriptural Argument, he assails the stronghold which his opponents regard as impregnable, and drives them before him step by step, until they have not a foot to stand upon. He gives quarter to none, and never asks it. He has not only the courage to challenge the best men in the rival camp, but he has the ability to vanquish them, and tell them the reason why. The question of Capital Punishment is one of extraordinary difficulty; but it has never yet had one who grappled with it so thoroughly as Dr. Carson. Not the least of the great merits of his book consists in this, that it is plain fact and cogent argument from beginning to end—so lucidly stated, in clear language, that the conclusions of the writer at once appeal to, and convince, the understanding of the reader."—*Coleraine Chronicle*.

"We commend this work to the careful perusal of the philanthro-

pist and the statesman. It embodies a large amount of powerful reasoning, and all but exhausts the subject."—*Western Star*, Ballinasloe.

"One of their great advocates, Dr. Carson, has published an able and thoughtful work on the subject."—*Belfast Newsletter*.

"We feel sure that this work cannot fail to serve the noble end for which it was written."—*Tyrone Constitution*.

"If this does not greatly assist in making some alteration in our criminal arrangements, it certainly ought to. It is full of evidence and argument unanswerable. Dr. Carson is no superficial writer, no enthusiast, no novice; he turns his attention to one of the greatest national and social subjects, and pursues his argument with an amount of ability, patience, and research which reflects the highest credit upon the mind and motive of the author."—*The Earthen Vessel*, London.

"If the enemy's works are not carried by storm, it is not for want of the most brilliant powers of logic and ratiocination on the part of Dr. Carson. We sincerely thank him for this manly, logical, and outspoken defence of what he sincerely believes to be the truth."—*The Gospel Herald*, London.

"Dr. Carson has subjected the question to a most exhaustive treatment. No important point is overlooked; but the chapter on the Scriptural Argument is by far the most important of all. We commend Dr. Carson's admirable work to all who desire to master this great public question. It is certainly the ablest defence of the Abolition of Capital Punishment that has yet been published. We can give no higher praise, and to give less would be unjust."—*Primitive Church Magazine*, London.

"Dr. Carson inherits much of the talent of his distinguished and honoured father, whose name and fame as a writer are spread over three continents. As a controversialist he had few peers in his day. His work on 'Plenary Inspiration' stands unrivalled in the province of Biblical Literature. His essay on 'Transubstantiation' has never been approached by any writer on polemical theology. His learned son is heir to much of his genius, and in the work before us has shown himself master of his theme. The treatise is exhaustive. In twelve chapters he embodies the entire chain of argument—both scriptural and legal—and proves to a demonstration that our penal code is in every respect defective and non-sanctioned by, as it is non-suited to, the genius and design of the Christian Dispensation. Dr. Carson has betrayed no ordinary amount of genius and well-digested research in preparing this masterpiece of thinking."—*The Herald and Daily Gazette*, Montreal, Canada, 2d June 1869.

Fifteenth Thousand, 2s. 6d.

THE HERESIES OF THE PLYMOUTH BRETHREN.

BY JAMES C. L. CARSON, M.D.

LONDON: HOULSTON & SONS.

This edition contains observations on the views of the Müllerites, the Newtonites, and the Darbyites; the Humanity of Christ; Socinianism of Plymouthism; the Righteousness of Christ; Mackintosh Valour; the Pastoral Office; Presidency of the Holy Spirit; the Law, a Rule of Life; Variations of Plymouthism; Morality of Plymouthism; Mr. Mackintosh's Recantation; and Mr. Darby's Replies to Dr. Carson. The views which are promulgated in this volume, on the great fundamental truths of Christianity, give the work an interest and importance which cannot be limited to any sect, time, or place, but must be as lasting as Christianity, and as wide as the world.

REVIEWS.

"Dr. Carson, like his illustrious father, seems in his element as a controversialist. He strikes home, and neither gives nor asks for mercy."—*Christian Cabinet*, London.

"Anything from the prolific pen of the learned writer must command attention, and we have ourselves perused his pamphlet with much interest."—*Western Star*, Ballinsloe.

"Dr. Carson seems to have inherited not a little of the intellectual vigour of his revered father, and we have no doubt but many who had a leaning to the Plymouth Brethren will thank him for this exposure of their doctrinal errors."—*Glasgow Examiner*.

"Dr. Carson has done his work with signal ability and logical acuteness, and has brought to light doctrines held and promulgated by some of these Plymouth missionaries, which cannot fail to startle the religious public in this country. Dr. Carson's masterly exposure of these dogmas cannot be too widely circulated."—*Londonderry Standard*.

"Dr. Carson has noticed and exposed this error, and several others, with becoming zeal and singular ability. He writes, in some respects, like his able and upright father, whose memory will long be embalmed in the hearts of truth-loving and out-spoken saints."—*The Voice of Truth*.

"The work published by Dr. Carson effectually exposes the real character of the Plymouthians."—*Morning Advertiser*, London.

"We wish to recommend once more, before closing the present article, the slashing pamphlet of Dr. Carson. We again commend this lively pamphlet to the reader."—*Record*, London.

"A combination of the most startling disclosures, conclusive refutations, and trenchant attacks."—*Baptist Magazine*.

"The heresies loudly called for an exposure, and this Dr. Carson has given them, with the skill and power of one who is thoroughly master of his subject."—*Primitive Church Magazine*.

"A well-written pamphlet, containing a complete refutation of some of the dangerous heresies of the Brethren. We wish the Doctor would pursue the work, and give to the public a large book on the same subject. He is well able; and it is greatly needed."—*Tyrone Constitution*, July, 1867.

"Dr. Carson has conferred a boon of great value on the whole of the Christian world, by his manly and able exposure of the Plymouth heresies. We thank him for his able defence of truth, and for his manly exposure of error. We pray that the mantle of his sainted father may ever rest upon his shoulders. He has done his work well."—Letter in *The Earthen Vessel*.

"Dr. Carson is a thorough 'chip of the old block.' He has the intensely quick perception of his illustrious sire, and, therefore, is no very pleasant critic where all is not thoroughly sound. No one will doubt what we say who will read this searching pamphlet."—*Baptist Messenger*.

"Dr. Carson has ably combated the principles and reasonings of the Brethren. . . . On the official orders and ministry of Churches, the writer has some excellent remarks. . . . This publication is worthy of attentive perusal, and those who are annoyed and disturbed by the pretentious sayings and doings of the 'Brethren' would do well to promote its circulation as widely as possible."—*The Gospel Herald*.

"We would strongly advise those who wish to understand the Plymouth principles to procure this vigorous pamphlet by Dr. Carson. He sets forth in clear and energetic language the peculiar views of this new and somewhat dangerous sect, and brings them to the test of the Word of God."—*The Bulwark*, Edinburgh.

"Of this pamphlet we shall only say, that we wish it had been longer. So far as it goes it is most excellent. We are much indebted to Dr. Carson for it."—*Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*, July 1862.

"Dr. Carson's withering exposures not only of their errors, but of their Jesuitical morality, cannot fail to produce a 'sensation' in the religious world."—*Standard*, Derry.

"The peculiarities of Plymouth Brethrenism are thoroughly sifted, scripturally tested, and faithfully exposed."—*Baptist Messenger*.

"This is a new edition of a work which we formerly noticed. The style of the author is calm and argumentative, and his opponents cannot complain of his zeal having betrayed him into using intemperate language. The errors which he charges the Brethren with are incorrect opinions as to the work and person of Christ; and if they are what Dr. Carson says, the Plymouth Brethren approach very near to the creed of the Unitarian and Socinian."—*Glasgow Examiner*.

"I had no idea that they held such heresies until I read this book by Dr. Carson, who is a son of the great Dr. Carson, of Tubbermore, Ireland, and who appears to be a son worthy of such a father—one on whom the mantle of the departed 'Elijah' has fallen. This work presents a thorough exposure, and complete refutation, of some of the heresies of that sect. It proves its author to be a man of no ordinary abilities—a

man competent for the task he has therein undertaken."—*The Canadian Baptist*, Toronto, Canada, September 3d, 1863.

"These Brethren have once and again been combated, but never, we believe, with the same success as on the present occasion. Dr. Carson is a powerful friend, and a very formidable adversary. He is largely endowed with the intellect, the penetration, we had almost said intuition, and the convincing logic of his admirable father, the far-famed Dr. Carson. The volume presents an analytical view of the whole subject. As a piece of polemical theology, we attach exceeding great importance to it; it is really a book of thought far beyond what might be supposed. A better shilling's worth of sound divinity and convincing logic is nowhere to be found. By making a physician of the author, his parents have spoilt a first-rate divine; however, even in that capacity he is not wholly lost."—*The British Standard*, February 13th, 1863, edited by the Rev. Dr. Campbell.

"This is the most exhaustive and thorough refutation of the Plymouth Heresies that has yet been published. Its author, Dr. Carson, wields a trenchant pen. He has applied the powers of an acute mind to fully master the theology and tactics of this most exclusive and self-righteous of all sects. . . . We have not space to notice the refutation of the theory that the law is not a rule of life, and other errors that are dealt with in this work in an unanswerable style. Dr. Carson's work is specially valuable for its withering exposure of the Jesuitry, prevarication, and evasion of Darby, Mackintosh, and other Brethren, who are certainly wanting in manliness and candour. . . . In Canada, as well as in Ireland, there have been instances of Plymouth teachers explicitly denying that they held certain doctrines that they had most clearly and unquestionably taught."—*The Christian Guardian*, Toronto, Canada, Nov. 9th, 1870.

"We scruple not to close this notice of books with one that is a vigorous and trenchant exposure of one of the chief offences of our times. It is written with wonderful keenness and fervour. It illustrates eternal principles, and has a universal interest. Dr. Carson shares largely in his honoured father's qualities, and nowhere has he shown them more largely than in this volume."—*Freeman*, April 14th, 1871.

"We most heartily welcome Dr. Carson's able exposure and thorough refutation of the Plymouth Heresies; and would tender him our cordial thanks for the labour of love to the Christian Church he has in this masterly work accomplished. Dr. Carson deserves the thanks of the Christian world, which we have no doubt he will receive; and his 'Plymouth Heresies,' we venture to predict, will long remain a standard work on this subject."—*Northern Ensign*, Wick, December 1st, 1870.

"It seems superfluous to review a book that has reached its thirteenth thousand, for surely that circulation has put an unmistakable value upon it. We therefore would just indicate that this is a thorough investigation of the whole religion of Brethrenism, and with a critical acumen that nothing is allowed to escape or evade the eagle-eyed vigilance of the author. Many persons will be both grieved and surprised at the startling revelations of this volume. Unsoundness of doctrine and heretical dogmas on subjects of greatest importance are here disclosed, so that the whole Christian Church is under obligations to Dr. Carson for his masterly vindication of the essential truths of the Christian faith."—*Baptist Messenger*, December 1870.

"The writer exhibits marvellous powers as a controversialist. His work should be in the hands of every seeker after truth."—*Londonderry Sentinel*, January 15th, 1871.

"This work is a masterly performance. It is just the book that is needed. . . . Every one should read this book."—*The Canadian Baptist*, Toronto, Canada, January 11th, 1872.

"Dr. Carson has a hereditary talent for controversy. . . . It is a remarkably vigorous and trenchant criticism of the peculiar doctrines of the Darbyites. . . . Orthodoxy could not have found an abler champion than the author."—*Daily Review*, Edinburgh, October 31st, 1870.

"This is a most able and seasonable volume, exposing a form of evil in the Church little understood—so little understood, that some of our ministers unwittingly connive at it. We would strongly advise them all to read Dr. Carson's volume."—*The Watchword*, managed by ministers of the Free Church of Scotland, Edinburgh, December 1870.

"It is not often that there comes under our notice a volume, which takes such a firm hold of the mind, that we are dragged on from page to page till we reach the last, but Carson's 'Heresies of the Plymouth Brethren' did not allow us time to do more than read a portion of scripture at family worship, glance at the war telegrams, and take food (which last we did with great reluctance), till every page had passed under our eye; and we have read every part of it a second time with undiminished interest and gratification."—Review in *The Christian Messenger*, Nova Scotia, January 1871.

"It bears the impress of a mind endowed with critical powers of the most exalted character. . . . The style of the book is Dr. Carson's own—original, forcible, argumentative, and convincing."—*Ballymoney Free Press*, November 1870.

"We have long been familiar with the theological writings of the elder Dr. Carson. We have now the pleasure of being introduced to those of his son. Of him and his work we would express an opinion in a single sentence, in saying that the Doctor is not a chip of the old block, he is the old block itself."—*Aberdeen Free Press*, November 1870.

"We have read this book with exceeding satisfaction. . . . It was an evil day for the Plymouths when they fell into the hands of Dr. Carson. . . . His style is so clear and telling and incisive that one is carried along his pages most pleasantly. His logical and argumentative powers are of a very high order. We most heartily recommend the work."—*The Evangelical Witness and Presbyterian Review*, April 1871.

"The volume we heartily commend to such as may wish to know what is objectionable in the teachings of Plymouthism, and to see an unanswerable exposure of the indefinite, contradictory, inconsistent, and oftentimes unintelligible statements in which errors are embedded. . . . It is only right that both ministers and people should be alive to the errors, both in doctrine and practice, which have shown themselves among the Brethren. For this purpose the volume before us is invaluable."—*Home and Foreign Record* of the Canadian Presbyterian Church, April 1871.

"Dr. Carson has done good service in exposing their heresies, pretensions, and gyrations. Conversant with the Scriptures from his youth, having clear views of the revealed doctrines of grace, and possessing

the logical faculty in a rare degree, he is keen in detecting and exposing the slightest deviation from the form of sound words. He writes in a manly, straightforward, trenchant style. Seeing clearly and decidedly for himself, he expresses himself in such a lucid manner, that it seems almost impossible for the weakest intellect to misunderstand him. He has no tolerance for anything savouring of evasion or trickery. Utterly incapable of descending to anything of the sort, he seems the very impersonation of honest and fair dealing. Christians have reason to thank him for his book. The perusal of it cannot but contribute to clearer views of the Gospel method of salvation. Even as an exercise for the intellectual faculties, it will be beneficial."—*The Covenanter*, December 1870.

"It must be evident to every honest and sound heart that Dr. Carson has done a good and noble work in exposing, with such manliness, ability, and success, 'the Heresies' referred to. To us, the richest portions of Dr. Carson's work are, his clear and unmistakable expositions of the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. How full of consolation is the thought, that whenever any body of professing Christian men have come forward to destroy the foundation of the faith once delivered unto the saints, God has always raised up a champion who, like David, comes forth in the strength of the Lord, to slay Goliath, and scatter the hosts of the Philistines. In the name of hundreds of thousands we thank Dr. Carson for the service he has rendered to the cause of Divine truth. His venerable father's mantle has certainly fallen upon him."—*The Earthen Vessel*, London, December 1870.

"The controversial mantle of the renowned father has evidently fallen upon the gifted son, and he, therefore, wields the same trenchant pen. . . . He exposes their false teaching with singular ability and tact. His logical deductions from their writings must be astounding to those who have not examined carefully the religious dogmas of these Plymouth divines. . . . True to his own honest convictions, as thus stated in his preface, he does expose the errors of the Plymouth sect with an unsparing pen, and then brings to bear upon them, with demolishing effect, the artillery of the inspired testimony. The Doctor's unwavering adhesion to the instruction of the Divine law book, shines out distinctly on every page of his book, and invests his argument with irresistible force. . . . His masterly exposition and defence of the pastoral office in the church as divine in its origin, and as perpetual in its obligations, has afforded us unmingled satisfaction. So delighted are we with his chapter on this subject, that we shall embrace an early opportunity to furnish copious extracts from it for the instruction and edification of our readers."—*The Christian Visitor*, St. John's, New Brunswick, November 24th, 1870.

Thirteenth Thousand,

THREE LETTERS ON THE REVIVAL IN IRELAND.

And also, Sixth Thousand,

ADDITIONAL LETTERS ON THE REVIVAL IN IRELAND.

BY JAMES C. L. CARSON, M.D.

These letters treat of the phenomena both in a philosophical and religious aspect; and the views which they contain will be found correct, when measured by the results of the Revival. They are contained in the volume called *Miscellaneous Papers*.

REVIEWS.

"The ablest refutation we have seen of the medical theories of *The Lancet*. Dr. Carson has here completely demolished the 'hysteric' theory of the Revival."—*Banner of Ulster*.

"Dr. Carson proves, in a manner the most conclusive, that the impression about hysteria is a great error. His views regarding the physical agency are put with great force and perspicuity."—*Morning Advertiser*, London.

"From the great interest of the subject, and the well-known ability of the learned author, these letters are published in a cheap form for general circulation."—*Derry Standard*.

"The more closely we examine his pages, we are struck with greater force by the ability with which Dr. Carson treats a most difficult subject."—*Tyrone Constitution*.

"The opinions enunciated are new, remarkable, and sound."—*Coleraine Chronicle*.

"They are the result of thoughtful inquiry into the causes of the physical manifestations."—*Christian Cabinet*, London.

"If ever a proposition was proved with the force of demonstration, this proposition has been so by Dr. Carson."—*Morning Advertiser*.

"This seems to be a rational way of accounting for the phenomena referred to."—*Derry Guardian*.

"Dr. Carson is an enlightened Christian philosopher, whose opinion on a question such as this, would go for as much with us as that of any person we know."—*Irish Evangelist*.

"Dr. Carson has done immense service by his practical and scholarly vindication."—*Banner*.

"The writer is esteemed one of the strongest-minded men in Ulster, and his letter will commend itself to the best trained and most cautious minds. His decision on the physical manifestations will be held to be final by all who know his high standing."—*Witness*, Edinburgh.

"On this point Dr. Carson, one of the most intelligent physicians in the North of Ireland, thus writes."—*London Review*.

"Dr. Carson has spoken in the character of a physician enlightened and sanctified."—*Revival*, by Rev. Dr. Massie.

"When such a man comes forward to attest to the genuineness of the Revival, it surely is a fact which must tell very strongly in its favour."—*The Daily News*, Kingston, Canada.

"Hence the value of Dr. Carson's very striking letter."—*Record*, London.

"His opinions are expressed in the spirit of a Christian philosopher."—*B. Scott, Esq., Chamberlain of London*.

"Dr. Carson appears to have disposed of the assertion that the affections were hysteria."—*Eclectic Review*.

"They are calculated to rectify numerous errors which have largely prevailed in reference to the manifestations alluded to."—*Derry Standard*.

"We are glad to see these masterly letters taken out of the fugitive columns of a newspaper."—*Banner of Ulster*.

"It needed some pen like that of Dr. Carson's to vindicate the cause of truth in brief and simple language."—*Tunbridge Wells Gazette*.

"It is truly refreshing to turn from the silly pamphlets by Dr. Bushnan, Archdeacon Stopford, and others, on the Revival, to those from the pen of Dr. Carson."—*Irish Evangelist*.

"They are clear, cogent, and temperate. The writer is a scholar, a gentleman, and a Christian; and the evidence he adduces in support of his views on the disputed points is both strong and convincing."—*Primitive Church Magazine*, London.

"The writers in the *Lancet* and other journals are satisfactorily dealt with in these able letters, by one who shows himself at once the man of accurate science and the devout and humble Christian."—*Wesleyan Sunday-School Magazine*.

"These letters embody a theory of bodily prostrations which is well entitled to attention."—*Aberdeen Free Press*.

Second Edition, 2s. 6d.

THE PERSONAL REIGN OF CHRIST

DURING THE MILLENNIUM PROVED TO BE IMPOSSIBLE.

BY JAMES C. L. CARSON, M.D.

LONDON: HOULSTON & SONS.

REVIEWS.

"Dr. Carson is the distinguished son of an honoured father; and both father and son have proved themselves great in controversy. . . . It is a trenchant refutation of the pre-millennial theory; and is extremely racy and readable. Confident Millenarians will probably read it with astonishment, and find it a very difficult task to attempt to answer it; while those who agree with the author will find good use for his arguments in reasoning with opponents. It is a valuable contribution to the Millennial controversy."—*Daily Review*, Edinburgh.

"His language is vigorous, his style perfectly lucid, and his treatment of opponents is fair and reasonable. . . . The proof is conducted by means of a very able and exhaustive analysis of the principal passages bearing on the subject. . . . In our opinion the argument is so complete and conclusive as to warrant the title of the book."—*Kelso Chronicle*.

"Dr. Carson is a vigorous and practised polemic, and his opponents need look well to the joints in their armour."—*The English Independent*, London.

"As is well known, the 20th chap. of Revelation is the chief stronghold of the Millenarian system. Acting under the belief that, if he can capture it, his aim at proving the personal reign to be impossible will be realised, Dr. C. deals upon the fortress blow after blow, and if it be not shattered in pieces, it will not be for want of good siege materials, and the forthputting of skill, courage, and energy in their application. . . . Rarely have the Millenarians met with a more trenchant assailant than Dr. Carson; how formidable and effective he is, may be inferred by the illustration we have given of his sledgehammer style, and the volume is replete with forcible argumentation from beginning to end."—*Dumfries Standard*.

"Dr. Carson's name is very familiar to our readers. He uniformly writes with great clearness and strength; and whether the reader is prepared to agree with him or not, it is impossible to misunderstand him, or not to respect his intellectual force."—*The Irish Evangelist* Dublin.

"Dr. Carson has studied the subject thoroughly, and can write upon it effectively as well as reverently."—*John O'Groat Journal*.

"The author adduces a great many texts to establish his position, and reasons upon them in a clear and forcible style."—*Belfast Newsletter*.

"He masses his arguments in support of his propositions in an array which his opponents will find impregnable; while those who have espoused—though in a half hearted and scarcely disguised feeling of trembling—the same side of the controversy, must have their fears for the stability of their views dispelled, and their doubts effectually dissipated."—*Coleraine Chronicle*.

"This is a little book on a great subject. Still, small as it seems, it suffices for its purpose, and accomplishes what it aims at."—*The Watchman*, London.

"In a style of logical reasoning which it is impossible to overturn, the author shows that the Millennial sovereignty of Christ upon earth is as completely impossible as it is evidently unscriptural."—*Ballymoney Free Press*.

"In the discussion of a difficult subject, Dr. Carson displays much ability and undoubted earnestness."—*Armagh Guardian*.

"The author has evidently studied the subject thoroughly; and the courage and ease with which he successively attacks and demolishes the strongholds of premillenarianism are admirable and refreshing."—*North British Daily Mail*, Glasgow.

"We must do Dr. Carson the justice to say that he argues the subject with keen and relentless logic, and in our opinion with entire success. He travels over the whole field of controversy, and drives his opponents out of one position after another, till it is difficult to imagine where they can find a foot of ground to stand on."—*Glasgow Herald*.

"We need only say that the work is written in Dr. Carson's usual style, evidently from an earnest conviction, and with a sincere regard for the authority of Scripture."—*Baptist Messenger*, London.

"Dr. Carson is well known from various works he has published to wield a pen little, if at all, less scholarly and vigorous than that of his late eminent father. This, his latest work, is certainly a very able production. The terse and lively style, and the clear and vigorous reasoning, sustain the interest of the reader to the end. . . . Starting from these incontrovertible principles, he follows the premillenarianists from passage to passage, dislodging them with total rout from each, until he has not left them a foot of the sacred territory on which to plant their banner. . . . The quotations he makes show that he has mastered the works of the leading writers on both sides of his subject; but he writes with such sturdy independence of thought, as makes it sufficiently plain that he calls no man Master. One can easily see that he believes in the plenary inspiration of Scripture from the manner in which he reasons from the very letter of it, yet he looks into it with his own eyes, and with such exercise of his own judgment as, in the case of the parable of the tares and the wheat, for example, sets him at issue with the great majority of the Commentators, though Arnot, we observe, in his work on the parables, very ably defends the same view."—*Original Secession Magazine*, Edinburgh, September, 1873. [I am glad to find that the Rev. William Arnot has taken, to a large extent, the correct view of this important parable; but I did not derive my opinions from him. If I had done so, I would gladly have acknowledged the fact in my book. Mr. Arnot's work was published in the

year 1866 ; whereas, my views on the parable of the Tares were written ten years prior to that date, and appeared at considerable length, in what was known as the Cooke controversy, through the newspaper press in 1856. My letters were published, by Mr. Morgan, in a pamphlet in the year 1857 ; and the argument on the Tares will be found in the fourteenth letter, which commences on the 81st page.—J. C. L. C.]

"It will require several Dr. Carsons to convince us upon this point, though he is certainly one of the most forcible reasoners in the circle of our acquaintance. We fear we are very like the good man who said he was open to conviction, but he would like to see the man who could convince him. Dr. Carson can easily rout us upon a point which is not our *forte*, but we still believe that the personal reign of Christ during the Millennium is quite possible ; indeed, we wonder how the brave Doctor can go in to prove anything *impossible*, which is not also immoral, so long as the Lord is omnipotent."—*The Sword and the Scepter*, March 1874. [I have here quoted the entire of this review, because I mean to make some observations on it. Nothing could delight me more than to be made the means, in the hand of God, of converting my dearly valued friend, the Rev. C. H. Spurgeon, to my own side of the Millennial question. I believe he is, beyond all comparison, the most eminently useful man in the world at present. No human tongue could tell the extent of good he is doing in the pulpit and through the press. Eternity alone can reveal it. His influence is immense. I therefore hope and trust he will yet review his position and change his opinions on the Personal Reign. If he should ever do so, I am certain he will acknowledge it forthwith, because he is a perfect personification of manliness and honesty. Mr. Spurgeon's remarks concerning the force of the reasoning put forth in my book are as favourable as I could wish ; and, with the candour which is natural to him, he confesses that I have defeated him upon a point which he says is not his *forte*. I must, however, say if I have been able to overturn his arguments, it is not because he has not ability to defend them, but it is owing entirely to the fact that he is on the wrong side of the question, and consequently has no solid ground to stand on. Mr. Spurgeon is not the man to be easily defeated on any subject which has a real foundation in Scripture ; and the fact of his arguments being overturned, I take as a sure proof that he has been standing on a rope of sand. The defect is in the subject, not in himself. But it is the last sentence in the review, which I especially wish to remark on, because it involves a principle of Biblical interpretation of overwhelming importance. There is nothing of which I am more jealous than the principles of interpretation, because it will almost invariably be found that errors take their rise from false foundation principles. Mr. Spurgeon wonders how I could undertake to prove anything impossible, which is not immoral, so long as God is omnipotent. Now, I am not aware of having rested the argument in my book on the point of omnipotence. The Personal Reign is not a question of *power* ; it is a question of Scripture testimony. It is impossible, because it is inconsistent with, and contradictory to, Divine revelation, and therefore cannot be true. This, and not power, is the line of my argument. But leaving this matter out of the question for the present, is it a fact that everything which is not immoral is possible to Omnipotent Power ? I deny it. Everything in which *power* is the point involved, is possible to omnipotence ; but there are many things which, though not immoral, are impossible to omnipotent power, just because they do not depend upon power at all, and have no more to do with it than with the attribute of Justice. It would be easy, for example, for God, as a matter

of power, to make a stone into a piece of bread ; but no power in heaven or on earth could make it bread while it still remained a stone. It could not possibly be bread and a stone at the same time. The thing is impossible, not because of power, but because of its own inconsistency. Again, it would be a very easy matter, in point of power, for Christ, in His own proper bodily person, to come to Jerusalem ; but it would not be possible under any power whatever, for His body to be in Jerusalem and in heaven at the same time. In His Godhead, He can be everywhere present, but His body must, as a matter of necessity in the very nature of things, be limited by space, and cannot possibly be in two distinct places at once. Further, as my father once said, "a man could not swallow the whole of his own body." This does not rest upon power, but on the fact, that "the container cannot be the contained." Two learned men were once talking about everything being possible with God, when a simpleton, who was standing by, immediately asked, "could He make two hills without a hollow?" That was a cracker for them. There would be nothing immoral in the performance, if it could only be done ; but Omnipotence could not do it, just because it is not a question of power at all. Power is no way concerned in it. The great O'Connell was once engaged conducting a trial where a Jew was accused of biting off a man's nose. The person charged declared that the man bit off his own nose. It was argued that this was impossible. "Nothing ish impossible wid God," said the Jew. The argument of the Jew is a very common one amongst theologians ; but it is a great mistake, and takes its origin in an over-anxiety to defend the power of God. God never requires such a defence. Everything concerning Him is resting on sure principles, and there never is the slightest inconsistency. The mistakes all arise from inaccurate thought. There is nothing in which power is the element concerned, impossible with God on the point of power ; but there are many things, although not immoral, which are impossible with God, just because they are inconsistent with the very nature of things, and power has nothing whatever to do with them. We should always be careful, when we come to the interpretation of Scripture, to make such accurate distinctions as will keep us out of error. It would be impossible to adopt Mr. Spurgeon's argument, and at the same time successfully oppose the doctrine of transubstantiation.—J. C. L. C.]

Price 2s. 6d.

MISCELLANEOUS PAPERS.

BY JAMES C. L. CARSON, M.D.

LONDON : HOULSTON & SONS.

CONTENTS.

THE SABBATH—THE LORD'S DAY—THREE LETTERS AND FIVE ADDITIONAL LETTERS ON THE REVIVAL IN IRELAND—THE NEW TRANSLATION OF THE SCRIPTURES—SCIENCE AND SCRIPTURE—A CHRISTIAN SPIRIT IN CONTROVERSY.

AUG 1 1991

